National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF HERMAN HEIJERMANS' *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN*: A POLYSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE ON THE TRANSLATION OF DRAMATIC DIALOGUE

BY

ANNIE TADEMA ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE AND FILM STUDIES

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 1994

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-11387-6

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:	Annie Tadema
TITLE OF THESIS:	English Translations of Herman Heijermans' *Op hoop van zegen*: A Polysystem Perspective on the Translation of Dramatic Dialogue
DEGREE:	Master of Arts
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED:	1994

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Annie Tadema

Annie Tadema
1203, 8515-112 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 1K7

19 April 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF HERMAN HEIJERMANS' *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN*: A POLYSYTEM PERSPECTIVE ON THE TRANSLATION OF DRAMATIC DIALOGUE** submitted by ANNIE TADEMA in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

M. V. Dimić

Prof. M.V. Dimić

Carl Hare

Prof. C. Hare

Prof. P.A. Robberecht

12 April 1994

ABSTRACT

The Dutch playwright Herman Heijermans (1864-1924) was a prominent figure in the theatre of the Netherlands at the turn of this century. His most celebrated play, entitled *Op hoop van zegen* (1900), is rooted in the naturalist movement, which was quickly becoming the dominant paradigm of Dutch literary and theatrical life at the time. The naturalist postulate that an artist should aim to depict "a slice of life" in his/her work finds its expression in the play's informal, dialectal language, which typifies the social, regional and occupational circumstances of the characters.

In this study the dramatic dialogue of *Op hoop van zegen* and its representations in the four existing English translations are examined according to the criteria of the polysystem theory, which seeks to describe texts from a pragmatic perspective. The polysystem approach incorporates extra-textual conditions into the comparative analysis of original and translation. These include such factors as historical, political, cultural, ideological, technical and commercial circumstances, which may dominate a certain literary or theatrical tradition at a particular time and place, and determine the conditions of reception of a text.

By making use of the theoretical framework of the polysystem theory, which allows us to describe the relationship between original and translation(s), it has become apparent that the dominant literary norms and models of a certain era are reflected in the works that emanate from the literary system in question. Therefore, due to the differing critical opinion and acceptance of naturalism at various times and places, the intensity of and the extent to which colloquial and dialectal dramatic dialogue is employed in the four English versions of *Op hoop van zegen* changes from text to text according to the priorities of the different translators. Although the translational norms of the translators may have been motivated by different personal and general criteria, such as the expectations of the respective audiences or the conventional models of the contemporary literary and theatrical tradition, it can nevertheless be concluded that all four were influenced, at least to some degree, by historically determined and explainable conventions, interpretations and practices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter 2: TRANSLATION OF DRAMATIC TEXTS 6

Chapter 3: HERMAN HEIJERMANS AND NATURALISM 23

Chapter 4: RECEPTION OF *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN* AND ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS 36

Chapter 5: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN* 46

Chapter 6: COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS 71

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 82

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this study to analyze and compare the four English translations of Herman Heijermans' play *Op hoop van zegen* (1900). Herman Heijermans (1864-1924) is one of the most renowned dramatists of the modern Netherlands. Not only are his works well-known and critically acclaimed in his home country, his dramas have also found appreciation in the international world of theatre, which is rather uncommon for plays originating from the relatively small area in which the Dutch language is spoken. Inspired by the naturalist movement that swept over Europe at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, Heijermans did not adhere to the ideal of *l'art pour l'art*, but strongly believed in the role of art in the fight against all social evil and the exposure of the methods and the men responsible for it. In his thirty years of literary production Heijermans wrote, among other things, numerous plays, which have been performed all over the world, on experimental and commercial stages, making him one of the leading European dramatists of the naturalist period.

Op hoop van zegen, the play we will be concerned with in this study, established Heijermans as an important new dramatist at the beginning of the twentieth century. It portrays the lives of ordinary Dutch fishermen and their families, and displays the unethical greed of shipowners, who care more for the insurance money than for the lives of the men who are sent to sea on unseaworthy vessels.

Op hoop van zegen was an instant success in the Netherlands as soon as it was performed. Barnouw indicates that no play by Heijermans, or by any other Dutch author, has been a success on the stage as long as *Op hoop van zegen* (111). In 1923, just twenty three years after it was first performed, the nine hundredth performance of *Op hoop van zegen* was celebrated in Amsterdam. The play also became known in the rest of Europe and in the United States, where the translations of *Op hoop van zegen* were repeatedly performed on the stage.

Judging from the numerous translations of *Op hoop van zegen*, the play was not only valuable to the native Dutch audience, which would clearly be able to identify with the subject matter, it was also of interest to foreign audiences. Moreover, it seems that, although the conditions in the fishing industry have changed from the time when Heijermans wrote the play, his creation was, and still is, worthwhile to contemporary audiences. Its lasting emotional and theatrical qualities give us a powerful description of the human condition, and enable us to see beyond the living characters in the play and discover the symbols Heijermans intended his characters to be.

The enduring quality of Heijermans' play is particularly clearly apparent from the many translations that have been produced during the last ninety years.[1] Only in English do we find four different translations of *Op hoop van zegen*, which were made in 1903, 1912, 1924 and 1984, thus encompassing a considerable time span. Three of the four English translations of *Op hoop van zegen* to be examined, all of which are entitled *The Good Hope*, were produced at relatively the same time as the original, ranging from 1903 to 1924. The earliest translation dates from 1903, and was made by Christopher St. John, who translated the play for actress Ellen Terry. The second translation by Harriet Gampert Higgins was apparently not meant to be performed on the stage. It appeared in *The Drama*, a review for dramatic literature, and was published in 1912. The third translation was produced by Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink, the playwright's sister. Although it was first published in 1924, it was not performed until October 1927 in New York. The last translation to be discussed was produced by Piet Reinier Knetsch in 1984. This translation makes up part of a dissertation entitled *"In Hope of Providence" by Herman Heijermans: a New Translation for Performance of "The Good Hope"* and was written at the University of Kansas. Although the subtitle indicates that it is meant to be performed, no evidence of its performance has been found.

In my examination of the four English translations of *Op hoop van zegen* I will not employ the usual, rather traditional approach to the analysis of source texts and their translations, which speaks of texts in terms of faithfulness, adequacy or equivalence. This approach can bring with it a highly judgmental attitude toward a translated text, which can easily be qualified as inadequate, simply because it does not stay close enough to the original. Up to now the translations of *Op hoop van zegen* have only been evaluated from this perspective, and described in terms of the somewhat dated criteria of the theory of postulated equivalence. In his dissertation, in which he reviews most of the previous scholarship on Heijermans both in Dutch and in English, Knetsch discusses the three earlier translations, judges them as inadequate, and tries to improve on them by introducing his own attempt at a translation of *Op hoop van zegen*. In his discussion of the previous translations we find such phrases as "inadequate" (106), "accurate interpretation" (107), and "faithful" (133, 143). In the methodology for the new translation Knetsch states that he has used two procedures "in an effort to develop a complete and faithful translation" of Heijermans' play, namely "faithful adherence to the original text aimed at developing dramatically effective dialogue, and verification of the interpretation" (143-46). The use of the above terms clearly points to Knetsch's adherence to the theory of postulated equivalence, by which he has also assessed the previous translations of *Op hoop van zegen*. Knetsch particularly focuses on the incompleteness of the texts and the inaccurate interpretations of the original by the previous translators, and concentrates mainly on linguistic and formal aspects. In his analysis Knetsch points out many cases of abbreviation and deletion, and places emphasis on misinterpretations and translational errors, but he does not try to explain why these shifts in the translated texts took place.

---

[1] *Op hoop van zegen* has been translated into many other languages, such as French, German, Russian, Swedish, Danish, Hebrew and Japanese, among others.

Taking into account the points raised by Knetsch, the subject of my comparative analysis will be to describe the translations of Heijermans' *Op hoop van zegen* from the perspective of the polysystem theory, whose pragmatic application will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. In contrast to Knetsch, I will not pass judgement on the translations, but pay close attention to the social, historical, political and literary contexts in which the texts were produced and performed, such as the role of theatre in the different cultures, its public and critical support, and the impact of the writer on his audience, as, according to the polysystem theory, these are valid criteria for the description and evaluation of translations.

The specific problems associated with the translation of a theatre text and the previous scholarship on this issue will be discussed in chapter 2, entitled "Translation of Dramatic Texts." In this chapter the complexity of the dramatic text is described and the difficulties of theatre translation are addressed, as are the views of the polysystem theorists on the subject of literary translation.

In the chapter on the translation of dramatic texts we will see that, just as an author of a text is influenced by the surroundings with which he/she is familiar, a translator is as well. Both author and translator are extremely sensitive to the standards of contemporary critical opinion and to the expectations of the audience, simply because, if they want to be successful, they need to comply with what is accepted. Therefore, as Heijermans, as one of the first authors from the Netherlands, was leaning towards the naturalist trend that was prominent in Europe at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, and we may assume that this influenced his writing, the movement of naturalism will be discussed in general terms in chapter 3, as well as the situation in the theatre and the attitude towards the naturalist playwrights in the Netherlands. The same will be undertaken for the United Kingdom and the United States, where the reception of the translated texts took place. These factors are of the utmost importance to the description of the translations of *Op hoop van zegen* and the understanding of the choices made and the translational strategies used by the translators.

Cultural and historical circumstances, which may have played a significant role in determining the final version of any text, can best be studied through an examination of the reception of a text. The analysis of the reception of a translation, in which we find reflected what was the accepted norm in the literary system at a particular time and place, will give us insight into how a translator arrived at certain choices, why he/she made these particular choices and how the result was received in the target culture. The reception of the translations of *Op hoop van zegen* will be studied in chapter 4. The discussion will concentrate on the 1903 and 1924 translations, the only two that have actually been performed on stages in the United Kingdom and in the United States. I have located several articles in which the different performances are discussed and evaluated. Since direct evidence of the reception of the 1912 and 1984 translations is non-existent, these texts will be studied from the broader perspective of their assumed function in the target culture.

In chapter 5, the comparative analysis of the four translations, which is based on the position of the polysystem theory, I will particularly focus on the matter of dramatic dialogue. Heijermans mostly used, what can be taken to be, regional speech and fishermen's dialect in his play, which poses a particularly difficult problem for the translator. Through the discussion of dialect in the original and its varying representations in the different translations, I will establish how the translators set about translating, what they tried to accomplish in their texts, what the functions of the translated texts were in the various target systems at the different times of reception, and how and, possibly, why these functions differ from that of the original.

The sixth and final chapter consists of the discussion of comparisons and conclusions, which are based on the theoretical frameworks discussed in this study. In this chapter the four English translations of Herman Heijermans' *Op hoop van zegen* are evaluated and compared according to the criteria of the polysystem theory with regard to literary translation. Conclusions will be drawn as to the degree to which extent peripheral factors, such as the socio-cultural environment, the literary institution, the quality of the production, the audience's expectations and its impression of the writer, and, most important of all, the position of the theatre at a certain time and place, may have been influential in the ultimate renderings of the different texts.

Chapter 2: TRANSLATION OF DRAMATIC TEXTS

The task of the translator is not an easy one. It is his/her responsibility to find the best way to transfer a text from one literary system to another. Although the source culture and the target culture sometimes appear to be closely related, there most frequently will be differences between the two, which the translator must try to resolve. The translator is faced with various problems. Translation from one language into another does not only involve questions of idiom, tone and style, but, more importantly, entails dealing with customs, assumptions and attitudes differing from culture to culture.

By now it is widely accepted among translation theorists that we cannot speak of translations strictly in terms of equivalence, because, as Edward Sapir pointed out in 1969,

> No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached (qtd. by Bassnett-McGuire 1980a, 13).

It is clear that there can be no question of complete equivalence between the source text and the target text. A translator is dealing with two different languages which, more often than not, exist in two different cultures with their own rules and conventions.

Rather than applying the terminology of postulated equivalence, in my analysis of the four English translations of Herman Heijermans' *Op hoop van zegen* I will make use of the views of the polysystem theory. The most prominent polysystem theorists, or scholars close to this approach, are Itamar Even-Zohar (Tel Aviv), Gideon Toury (Tel Aviv), José Lambert (Leuven), Susan Bassnett-McGuire (Warwick), James S. Holmes (formerly Amsterdam) and Theo Hermans (London), of whom Susan Bassnett has dealt most extensively with the translation of theatre texts, the subject of this chapter. The polysystem theory is not based upon the argument of postulated translational equivalence, but studies translations from a broader, more empirical and systemic point of view.

Instead of the "mechanistic collection of data" analyzed on the basis of material substance, the polysystem theory employs a functional approach based on the analysis of relations that exist within semiotic systems (Even-Zohar 1979). The earmark of the polysystem theory is its multiplicity. As Even-Zohar points out,

> ... a semiotic system is necessarily a *heterogeneous, open* structure. It is, therefore, very rarely a *uni*-system but is, *necessarily*, a *poly*system — a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent (1979, 290).

Literature is regarded as one of these complex systems, made up of sub-systems that influence each other. The relations between these systems are constantly in flux according to which norms or models are dominant at a certain time and place. All theoretical assumptions are assigned a relative, historical value, which is governed by the norms and models of the authors, texts, institutions and readers of that specific time and place (van Gorp 1991). Since "all literature, all interpretations of literature and literary practices are historically determined, whether they belong to the dominant or to the dominated systems" (van Gorp 1991, 312; translation mine), the polysystem theory examines texts in their respective contexts, and incorporates intellectual, historical, and societal circumstances into the evaluation of these texts.

The polysystem theory sheds new light on the theory of literary translation, because it looks upon texts and their translations as being part of the totality of the literary system. Even-Zohar claims that

> ...not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position within the polysystem, but the very practice of translation is strongly subordinated to it. And even the question of what is a translated work cannot be answered *a priori* in terms of an ahistorical out-of-context idealized state: it must be determined on the grounds of the operations governing the polysystem.

> Seen from this point of view, translation is no longer a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a cultural system. Consequently, such key concepts as adequacy and equivalence cannot be dealt with fairly unless the implications of polysystemic positions are taken into account (1978, 125-26).

In other words, the polysystem approach does not consider texts and their translations in isolation, but in the context of the system of a particular literary tradition. A text is not written in a vacuum, but rather, it is produced by an author who lives at a particular time and in a certain environment. The author is likely to have been influenced by the cultural and literary norms and conventions of the time. Therefore, it can be concluded that a text is embedded in the culture in which it was created (the source culture). It is part of that literary tradition, and shows the features that are specific to that tradition at a certain moment of its development.

The polysystem theorists' views with regard to literary translation are different from those of other translation scholars in that they do not prescribe rules and norms as to what a translation should look like. The polysystem theory is a descriptive and interpretative theory, which, when dealing with literary translation, is concerned with the study of translational norms which are relevant for conversion procedures and the existing relationship between original and translation. Thus, the polysystem theorists do not make judgements of translations in terms of adequacy or equivalence, but analyze and evaluate the position of the translation in the target culture. The most important question concerns the function of the translation in the target system. Does the translation still reflect the features of the source language text or has it fully been integrated into the target system? The reaction of the new audience to the translation also needs to be considered and compared to that of the audience in the source culture, in order to be able to establish and analyze the position of the text in the new system.

Although the transfer of any text that is meant to be read, such as a literary or an informative text, from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL), which both have their specific norms and conventions, is a difficult process, the translation of theatre texts is a particularly complex exercise, because of the very nature of these texts. In the translation of theatre texts there are factors to be taken into account other than merely those of a linguistic, literary, and societal nature. The dramatic text does not only exist as a literary work expressed in written language to be appreciated through reading and discussing, but, moreover, stands in a dialectical relationship with its performance. It usually serves as a script for a performance on the stage, involves instant communication, and orders the use of non-verbal and non-discursive semiotic signs that make up the theatrical work and give it form and coherence. As Roman Ingarden puts it:

> The stage play is a borderline case of the literary work of art [...] to the extent that, besides language, another medium of representation exists within it — namely, the visual aspects, afforded and concretized by the players and by the "decor," in which represented things and persons, as well as their actions, are depicted (377).

Although, as we have now established, proportions of non-verbal elements are present in a theatre text, the importance of language in such a text must not be underestimated. Put simply, language is fundamental to theatre, at least in the Western tradition, in that it creates situation and embodies action.[2] The theatre text is written in a language which is aimed at creating a specific effect on the audience by special rhythm, phrases and flow of sentences. Quoting from R.P. Blackmur's essay "Language and Gesture," Robert Corrigan suggests the following:

> "When the language of words most succeeds it *becomes* gesture in its words." He [Blackmur] sees that gesture is not only native to language, but that it precedes it, and must be, as it were, carried into language whenever the context is imaginative or dramatic. Without a gestural quality in language there can be

---

[2] It must be noted that there are instances of theatre without dialogue, e.g., mime, or without fixed dialogue, e.g., the *commedia dell'arte*, but in the majority of cases, even in these forms of theatre, a written scenario forms the guide for and nucleus of the performance.

no drama (98).

It has been generally assumed that gesture and non-verbal elements are encoded into the dramatic text, which poses a complex problem for the translator of dramatic literature. Ortrun Zuber points out that

> ... ideally, a dramatist would make use of all the non-verbal icons, of all the non-verbal and verbal symbols he can design, in order to convey his message by pictorial as well as linguistic means, and through verbal as well as non-verbal means of communication, thus achieving a combined and enhancing effect. The same applies to the translator of a play who might even need to render a verbal sign into a non-verbal sign at times and vice versa, whichever translation is most appropriate (1980c, 61).

The German translator and critic Hans Sahl gives an apt description of translation for the theatre. He paraphrases the problem of the translator of dramatic texts by comparing it to *mise en scène* in the following: "Übersetzen heißt, ein Stück in einer anderen Sprache inszenieren" (105).

It seems that in the past the development of a theory for the translation of theatre texts has somewhat been ignored. The translation of dramatic texts did not occupy a clear position, and was not really considered to belong to the fields of literary studies, linguistics or to that of theatre studies. When it *was* examined, as Mary Snell-Hornby points out, the emphasis was placed not so much on the language of theatre texts as on the study of individual authors and the way in which to deal with the problem of versification, which was an important issue in the translation of Greek and Latin ancient drama (1984, 102). However, some critics seemed at least to acknowledge the different character of translation for the theatre. Two centuries ago, in his "Brief an den Übersetzer der *Elektra*" Ludwig Tieck took the opportunity of discussing the problem of the special theatrical aspects of dramatic texts when he wrote the following:

> Denn das scheint mir ein Hauptvorzug Ihrer Übertragung, daß die Sprache so ganz dramatisch, so ungeschwächt und ungezwungen ist, daß sie jedesmal Leidenschaft richtig ausdrückt, ohne die oft etwas linkischen und erzwungenen Wendungen zu gebrauchen, in welche der Gelehrte, der Philologe oft verfällt, der sich nicht die wirkliche Rede, den natürlichen wahren Dialog des Theaters deutlich machen kann (qtd. by Snell-Hornby 1984, 102).

It is clear from this passage that Tieck did have insight into the matter of dramatic transposition as a specialized form of translation. He praises the translator of *Elektra* for using a natural and easy-flowing language, which makes the play more performable in the TL system.

The complexity of dramatic texts has been much written about in recent years. It became generally assumed in the seventies that the theatre text does not just consist of the written words on the page, but is largely determined by other factors present in the text. As Susan Bassnett-McGuire indicates, Tadeusz Kowzan purports the view that "the written text [...] is merely one component among several, and a performance may involve as few or as many of the different systems as are thought necessary" (1985b, 88). Kowzan identifies five basic categories of expression that make up the theatre text and have an impact on the making of a performance. These categories are the spoken text, bodily expression, the actor's external appearance (gestures, physical features, etc.), the playing space (size of venue, props, lighting, etc.), and non-spoken sound (Bassnett-McGuire 1985b, 88). Kowzan stresses the fact that the categories — and their subdivisions — are non-hierarchical in nature and therefore all equally important.

Mary Snell-Hornby further elaborates on the nature of the theatre text. As she explains in "Sprechbare Sprache — Spielbarer Text," the performability of a text is dependent on the potential interaction between the actors on the stage and the audience (1984, 104). It is precisely this that makes a dramatic text such a complex entirety. In her article Snell-Hornby distinguishes five main components of the dramatic text, which constitute a complex whole (1984, 104-08).

The first component consists of the division of the text in main text (dialogue) and secondary text (stage directions). Dialogue is a significant aspect of theatre texts, since the exchange of dialogue "does not merely [...] refer deictically to the dramatic action, but directly *constitutes* it" (Elam 1980, 157). A literary expression, dramatic dialogue has in common with other literary utterances the specially structured language, which makes a text a work of art. This feature of artificiality is perhaps the most important of all. As Tennyson claims, "for the paradox of dramatic dialogue is that, even for dialogue to sound natural, it must be artificial" (34). The distance to everyday language may be big or small, but the artificiality remains, even though the dramatic text may come very close to everyday language, such as for example in the drama of the naturalists. We can conclude, then, that theatre texts are made up of a language that is not natural, but created especially for its effect. It must be clear and enigmatic at the same time, as well as comprehensible and easily accessible. It should be complete, but also incomplete in order to leave some room for theatrical representation. The dramatic text must be informative, but should most of all make the spectator feel involved in the subject matter.

The second main element of the theatre text is its multiple perspectivity, which results from the multiplicity of meanings present in the message, the interaction of different performances and their impact on different audiences. A stage performance can be considered as extremely unstable. A performance is transitory and subject to change according to the reading of the director, the interpretation of this reading by the actors, the achievement of the actors, the reaction of the audience, and the physical environment. Whereas the theatre text remains fixed and permanent on paper, each theatre performance based on this fixed text is different and unique. It is the translator's task to recognize the multiple perspectives of the theatre text, understand them, and decide which are crucial to the text and the performance as a whole. Only after such an evaluation he/she can proceed with a translation in which the most important perspectives are incorporated.

The next component of a dramatic text mentioned by Snell-Hornby is the importance of dramatic language as a vehicle of rhythmic progression. Because words in the theatre are heard and not read, the rhythm and other sound characteristics play a large role in determining the complete picture. As already established, the theatre language is an artificial one, which is structured in a particular way, so as to express contradictory concepts and to be elusive. The translator must remember that the writer of the original did not use words, syntax and sentence structure at random. The way in which a particular play is written may reflect the beliefs of the author or those of his/her time. For example, as we shall see, naturalist playwrights were inclined to use language in a manner that was claimed to be "natural" and representative of everyday, lower class speech, in an attempt to communicate a sense of authenticity to the audience. The naturalist playwrights tried to convey their message through their use of a language chosen specifically for the purpose of signalling to the audience that the action was intended to be an approximation of reality.

It seems that playwrights frequently make use of a specific format in order to communicate their views. Every element in the text, from formal structure to encoded gestural patterning, will serve this purpose. Therefore, the translator must be aware of small changes in register, tone and style, which may be very closely connected to specific contexts in both the SL and the TL systems.

The fourth component takes us further than the formal structure of a dramatic text. Mary Snell-Hornby shares Kowzan's opinion that theatre language is not just an intellectual abstraction. The language of theatre does not only consist of spoken language, but also of facial expression, gestures and movements of the actors, which can help to clarify the meaning of the words. It is important for the translator that he/she choose the right words, so that language and expression are incorporated into the same comprehensible whole. In other words, the translator must try to use the formal structure in such a way that sentence organization, rhythm and emotion are all represented, and form part of a coherent pattern within the overall structure of the dramatic text.

The last component of the dramatic text concerns the role of the audience. The audience undergoes a theatre performance as a concrete experience. It is not merely a curious and unprejudiced group of people. An audience has a certain socially and culturally determined "horizon of expectations," which is expected to be met. This means that a play that is translated for a performance in a new system does not only have to be actable and speakable, but, more importantly, the action, actors and dialogue should be understandable, plausible and probable for the TL audience. Therefore, translators often more or less adjust the original text to the theatrical conventions of TL culture in an attempt to integrate the translated text into the TL system, thereby making it comprehensible and reasonably accessible to the new audience. It is clear that the translator should not only be aware of the expectations of the TL audience, he/she should also know the TL theatre well, so that variations in the different theatre traditions can be recognized and resolved.

So far we have dealt with theories on the relationship between the written and the performed, their common feature being the idea that the written text contains a series of clues for performance that can be isolated and defined. From what has been discussed, we can conclude that it is the task of the translator of theatre texts to attempt to transfer the total experience of oral and non-verbal language as well as reason and emotion into the language of the target culture. In addition, cultural, historical, ideological and socio-political aspects as well as traits specific to the source and target theatres need to be considered. The popular assumption that stage texts are more than just words on the page adds an important problem to the already difficult task of the translator of theatre texts. He/she is now responsible for transferring a text that is part of a dialectical relationship with other systems. In other words, the translator is working with a text that is *incomplete* in itself, "rather than [...] a fully rounded unit, since it is only in performance that the full potential of the text is realized" (Bassnett-McGuire 1980a, 120). Like Bassnett-McGuire, Keir Elam also argues that the dramatic text is constrained by its performance. In *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* he maintains that

> The "incompleteness" factor [...] suggests that the dramatic text is radically conditioned by its performability. The written text, in other words, is determined by its very need for stage contextualization, and indicates throughout its allegiance to the physical conditions of performance, above all to the actor's body and its ability to materialize discourse within the space of the stage (1980, 209).

Similarly and more recently, the theatre semiotician Patrice Pavis has claimed that "real" translation can only take place on the level of the *mise en scène*, which suggests that "the stage takes over from the linguistic text" as the most important consideration for the translator of theatre texts (1989, 30).

In a 1985 article entitled "Ways Through the Labyrinth" Susan Bassnett-McGuire proposes ways for the translator to deal with the intricate problems of theatre translation. She describes five strategies which may have been employed in the translation of dramatic texts (1985b, 90-92). The first strategy is the translation of a dramatic text as if it were a literary work. The translator does not take into account that the text is meant to be performed on the stage, and therefore only the meaning of the words is translated, and rhythm, tone, and visual imagery and symbolism is ignored. This strategy frequently results in a translation that attempts to be "faithful" to the original.

In the second translational strategy mentioned by Bassnett-McGuire the cultural setting of the SL text is used as a framework for the TL text. This type of translation can involve the stereotypization of characters in the SL culture to provide a comic effect. Naturally, this strategy would cause a major ideological shift in the place and position of the text in both systems. In the SL culture the play may be a serious work, whereas in the TL culture it is now used to depict "comic foreigners."

The third strategy for the translation of theatre texts is the translation of "performability," the consideration of the performance dimension of the text. Under features of performability Bassnett-McGuire understands the translation of regional dialect in the SL text into a regional dialect of the TL system, the creation of equivalent registers in both systems and the omission of passages that seem to be too closely bound to the cultural and linguistic context of the SL system (1985b, 91). However, the concept of performability has currently come under fire. Whereas Susan Bassnett maintained earlier (e.g., 1980a, 1985b) that it is important for the theatre translator to consider the performance dimension of the written text and its relation with the contemporary audience, in a more recent article entitled "Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against Performability" she argues against the notion of encoded gestural patterning in the theatre text.[3] She claims that if this were the case

> the task of the translator [...] becomes superhuman — he or she is expected to translate a text that *a priori* in the source language is incomplete, containing a concealed gestic text, into the target language which should also contain a concealed gestic text. [...] Common sense should tell us that this cannot be taken seriously (1991, 100).

Bassnett further points out in this article that "if a set of criteria could be established to determine the "performability" of a theatre text, then those criteria would constantly vary, from culture to culture, from period to period and from text type to text type" (1991, 102). She dismisses the idea of performability as an avenue of escape for translators, seeing it only as "an excuse to exercise greater liberties with the text than convention allowed" (1991, 105). This does not mean, however, that theatre texts should be considered as identical to texts written merely to be read. Although the process of writing a theatre text involves consideration of the performance dimension, an abstract notion of performance cannot be put before textual considerations (1991, 110-11). Bassnett argues that textual considerations should take precedence over the "highly individualistic" notion of performance, and that "the satisfactory solution of such textual difficulties will result in the creation of a target language text that can then be submitted to the pre-performance readings of those who will undertake a performance" (1991, 111). In other words, Bassnett favours a cooperative approach which, in this case, involves the input of the translator as well as that of the director and the actors.

---

[3] In *Translation Studies* (1980a) and "Ways Through the Labyrinth" (1985b) Susan Bassnett declares that the written text is part of a larger complex of sign systems. She argues that "a theatre text exists in a dialectical relationship with the performance of that text. The two texts — written and performed — are coexistent and inseparable, and it is in this relationship that the paradox for the translator lies" (1985b, 87). In "Translating for the Theatre," however, Bassnett rejects the notion of the encoded gestural subtext, "perceiving it as a concept that belongs to a particular movement in time in western theatre history and which cannot be applied universally" (1991, 111).

The fourth strategy for the translation of theatre texts described by Bassnett in "Ways Through the Labyrinth" applies to the translation of verse drama. Frequently, verse texts have been translated from one language into another without retaining the same verse form. These translations can be described as attempts at foregrounding the metrical patterns of the SL text, and at the same time rejecting the verse form of the original, which does not translate well or sound naturally in the TL system. This strategy can result in "obscure" or "meaningless" texts, "where the dynamics of the SL text no longer come across" (1985b, 91).

The fifth and last strategy for the translation of theatre texts mentioned by Bassnett-McGuire is cooperative translation, which, she claims, probably achieves the best results. Cooperative translation involves two people working together on the TL text, preferably a SL and a TL native speaker, or a person who knows the SL and works together with the theatre company. In some cases it can be the translator himself who is involved in the theatre production. In that case we may call him a scenario writer, whose work is further adapted by the director of a play. Cooperative translation is almost always produced with the performance of the text in mind. The translators are very much aware of the problems posed by differing theatre conventions in the SL and TL systems, different styles of performance in different countries and the expectations of dissimilar audiences.

Being a polysystem theorist, Susan Bassnett-McGuire purports the view that any literary text, including theatre texts, whether it is an original or a translation, is a product of its time, society and creator, and is therefore conditioned by the conventions of its environment.

> The theatre of a given society will inevitably comprise a set of culturally determined codes that are performance conventions but are also present in the written text (1985b, 92).

It is up to the translator to recognize these conventions and to try to transfer the significance of their meaning to the TL system.

Bassnett-McGuire sees the strategy of cooperative translation as the most useful and practical in the translation of dramatic texts, because it is concerned with deictic units, which determine the codes of performance. Since the translators of a cooperative translation are assumed to be native speakers of both the SL and TL systems, they would in most instances have an instinctive sense of deixis. Keir Elam also recognizes the importance of deixis in the theatre text. He suggests that dramatic dialogue is conventionalized and based on "an *I* addressing a *you here and now*" (1980, 139), which brings Bassnett-McGuire to the conclusion that deixis lies at the origin of dramatic discourse. The function of the deictic elements in the text is important, because if these elements are changed the text will be radically altered. Bassnett-McGuire claims that

> by analysing the way in which the deixis operates in the SL text, it will become apparent whether those units can be viable in the TL, what they signify by their presence and equally by their absence, what happens to the dynamics of the scene when they are altered (1985b, 98).

Consequently, it is of the utmost importance that the translator recognize, analyze, and work with these elements in order to reach the best possible results. Equally, in analyzing and judging a translation of a play, the same elements will have to be submitted to particular scrutiny.

In the same vein, Theo Hermans makes an interesting observation with regard to proper names in literary translation. Hermans points out that the majority view on proper names in literature is that they "possess a certain deictic quality" (1988,11). They point directly to a single, concrete referent. However, from a translational perspective, Hermans divides proper names into "conventional" names, which have no meaning in themselves, and "loaded" names, which are suggestive or expressive of the persons who carry them (1988, 13). Hermans makes a compelling argument concerning the study of proper names and its importance for the descriptive study of translation. He claims that

> to the extent that some proper names are formally language-specific and/or

> semantically 'loaded' on account of their being expressive or suggestive or carrying some other kind of information, the manner in which they are handled by the translator will provide valuable clues to the overall orientation of the translation. In the act of translation, the choice to be made in each instance between the various theoretical possibilities [...] is subject to translational norms — whether weak or strong, personal or collective, imposed or freely adopted — which may be assumed to govern other decisions regarding other parts of the text as well (1988, 14).

In its strongest form this statement implies that we may assume that the treatment of proper names by the translator is representative of his/her translational strategies underlying the target text as a whole. A more reasonable assumption, however, is that "the handling of proper names allows us to formulate initial hypotheses regarding the nature and relative strength of the translator's norms" (14). In a discussion of personal names in drama translation, Brigitte Schultze argues that it is important to note that the translator's final decision about the rendering of proper names is closely connected with his/her understanding of cultural transfer and cultural identity (1991, 94). The translator evaluates the names used and defines the position of specific names within a cultural context. Schultze points out that ever since the second half of the nineteenth century and thereafter it seems to have been the prevailing tendency to retain personal names in their source side form, regardless of the occurrence of cultural identity in the original text (94). This trend is indicative of the wish to safeguard the source text's proper ethnological context. It highlights the foreign cultural setting by allowing the original names to stand out as recognizably foreign, thereby producing a source-oriented (or adequate) translation.

Taking this argument of deictic units as a point of departure, it may be argued that theatre texts are particularly time-bound, precisely because of the fact that they are largely composed of dialogue in which the contemporary perspective of the author is expressed. It is part of the role of the translator to keep the text current. However, colloquialisms, slang and dialect, which frequently are vital elements of the dialogue of plays, especially in naturalist plays, are continually changing.

The nature of the spoken language in literature finds its limits in the decisions made by the author and in the expectations of the audience. The dramatic language used by the author, in its force and immediacy, creates the setting, the world within which the action takes place. Dawson points out that "the nature of a play's world determines what can happen within the play, limits the possible situations, the range or depth of the action, e.g., confining the characters and their speech to a particular social class — one very obvious way of defining a world" (24).

It is clear that it is extremely difficult to represent pure everyday language with its ever-changing colloquialisms and spontaneity owing to the simple fact that a text is written down and therefore fixed. However, during various periods in history authors and playwrights have tried to represent dialogue that came as closely to real spoken language as possible, the best-known of such practitioners being the writers of realism and naturalism. Naturalist writers brought the less privileged common man on the stage complete with their selective representations of dialect and grammatically incorrect speech. During this period authors made the choice to deviate from the standard literary language because they wanted to create the illusion of representing the lives of ordinary citizens and present the audience with a "slice of life." Historically, or in a Marxian sense, we can explain the use of dialect as the celebration of the working class, both urban and rural, who are more apt to speak in the expressive tones of regional usage. Dialect in literature may be used by the playwright with the intention to characterize the social status of the group he describes. It can also be used to identify a character by showing his educational and cultural background as well as his general attitudes, and it may reflect the characteristics of the people who use it.

Naturally, the use of, what is the playwright's representation of, regional and social dialect, which we see illustrated in Heijermans' play *Op hoop van zegen*, poses a particular problem to the translator. In addition to the aspects of the dramatic text which make it an artistic construct, he/she not only has to grapple with the extensive use of dialect throughout the play, but also with the scope of such utilization. The question to be asked is whether, in order to save the author's intention in the translation, it is best to translate the play into a dialect which the audience can recognize as being used by a particular social group, class or profession, or if other alternatives can be found. The translator has to bear in mind that the use of dialect in a text may influence the reader's — or spectator's, in our case — opinion of the work in a negative way. Eva Burkett points out that "unless the reader is familiar with the dialect or has knowledge of people who speak the dialect, his understanding and appreciation of the writing will be lessened" (8). Nevertheless, Ortrun Zuber, who advocates a prescriptive approach to the translation of theatre texts, suggests that

> the task of the translator as well as that of the producer of a modern play should be to transpose the play in such a manner, that the message of the original and the dramatist's intention be adhered to as closely as possible and be rendered, linguistically and artistically, into a form which takes into account the different traditional, cultural and socio-political background of the recipient country (1980b, 95).

In other words, the translator must find a way to represent both the intent of the author of the original, and, at the same time, keep in mind the performance dimension of the text, which will be staged before a TL audience.

Colloquialisms, slang and dialect in the theatre are mostly used to keep a play's characters as close to reality as possible. However, Franz H. Link points out that the closer a playwright tries to resemble reality, the more language tends to drift away from reality in terms of time, since these forms of language easily become dated, as we see for example in plays of the naturalist period (28). According to Link, a play written in dialect must be translated into an idiom of the time of performance, because the audience will find it hard to accept older forms, which might hardly be known, and are not shared by everyone. He claims that "as long as [the dialect] is understood, it localizes the characters speaking it. If it is no longer understood language used must be neutralized or translated into another dialect" (29). Link further points out that, when using dialect, the playwright's intention may be to characterize the social status of its participants. He maintains that "to realize such an intention, the play must always be translated into the dialect which is recognized by the audience as being used by the corresponding social group in their part of the country" (29). It is apparent from Link's use of words that his approach to the translation of dialectal dramatic texts is a highly prescriptive one. Although his normative methods have a certain hypothetical validity, in practice the translator frequently discovers that such theoretical frameworks are unworkable.

In conclusion, it seems evident that the dramatic text is a highly complex structure, which is made up of a written text, and additionally, and equally importantly, of gesture and other non-verbal elements. From what has been discussed previously it has become clear that there exists no magic formula for the translation of theatre texts. The translator has to establish his/her own procedures of dealing with the intricate nature of the theatre text. The translation of dialectal theatre texts is a particularly difficult undertaking, on which a limited amount of critical literature is available. It appears that it is important for the translator of literature written in a dialect to first identify the specific type of dialect used, after which some of the following questions may be asked: How is the dialect in the SL text to be represented in the new TL text? Can a more or less corresponding speech be found and used? How will the audience react to this specific use of language?

It is clear, however, that, while a text in regional speech, marked by profession and social status, such as Heijermans' *Op hoop van zegen*, certainly presents more problems and challenges for the translator than a text in standard language, it also affords him/her the opportunity to analyze both the SL and TL texts to the very heart, seeking out the subtle nuances and shades of pitch, tone, pacing and meaning.

Chapter 3: HERMAN HEIJERMANS AND NATURALISM

According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* naturalism in its general philosophical sense is a theory which ties science to philosophy by stating that all things in the universe are natural. In this theory nature can be completely known through scientific investigation. Naturalism affirms that in nature there exists a certain "regularity, unity and wholeness that implies objective laws, without which the pursuit of scientific knowledge would be absurd" (560).

In literature the term naturalism is applied to the aesthetic movement of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries which makes use of a method of literary composition aiming at a detached, scientific objectivity in the depiction of natural man. Although naturalism in a literary sense is often confused with realism, it is more correct to say that naturalism extends the tradition of the realists, hoping to give, without moral judgement, an even more faithful representation of reality. Whereas in the general philosophy of realism there exists the hope that man has the reason and will to improve his condition through his moral and rational qualities, or at least recognizes the need for improvement, naturalism is deterministic in that it tends to "regard emotional instability, selfishness and moral blindness as inherent in the nature of man" (*The Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama* 704).

As Furst and Skrine point out, the shaping factors behind the entire movement of naturalism, which provided its content, its literary method, its direction and its mood of determinism can be found in the social, scientific, philosophical and ethical trends of the nineteenth century (10). The nineteenth century was in many respects a period of dramatic change. The philosophies of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Comte (positivism), and the ideas of Marx and the discoveries of Darwin, Pasteur and others had a great impact on the general view on the relationship between man and his environment, the individual and society, and man and his fate. In addition, the societies of both Western Europe and North America were transformed during the hurried advance of the Industrial Revolution, gradual emancipation of women and the development of big cities, which posed many new problems for society. Furst and Skrine indicate that "the scientific discoveries of the age forced man to a total re-assessment of his view of himself both as a physical and as a moral being. Never before had man's environment, his image of himself, his attitude to himself altered so deeply in so relatively short a span of time"(10). Of the scientific discoveries mentioned above, the most important and the most controversial was made in the field of the biological sciences. In 1859 Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, in which he states that man is descended from lower animals and that in life there must be an ongoing struggle leading to the "survival of the fittest" through natural selection.

Darwin's theory was of great importance for the subsequent development of naturalism in literature. Unlike the romantics before them, the naturalists did not idealize man, but instead they deliberately reduced him to the animal level, attributing to him no higher aspirations. Naturalists portrayed man as being controlled by his instincts or his passions, by his social and economic environment and other constraining circumstances. In the naturalist view, man has no free will and no responsibility for his actions, because these are beyond his control. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* indicates that individual characters were regarded as products of heredity and the environment, acting only on instinct and brought down by social and economic pressures. They were not to be held responsible for their fates, which were by definition negative from the outset. Consequently, the naturalists had a preference for the depiction of simple and humble characters, who are motivated by elementary passions and live in the most oppressive environments, which are described in dreary detail (559-60).

Although there are fundamental common factors in the literature of the different countries in which the new naturalist movement took root, such as the objective portrayal of closely observed reality, the adoption of a scientific method and a certain belief in determinism, Chevrel suggests that we cannot speak of naturalism as a single, unified movement with a clear-cut outline. As with every literary movement, it is difficult to pin down naturalism to a specific and well-defined time and place. We cannot identify the movement of naturalism with a particular writer, or reduce it to a single writer, because it was prevalent in different countries at different times (1983, 9-20). While the limits of naturalism are hard to define, Chevrel remarks that naturalism is usually said to have begun in France as early as 1871, which constituted the end of the Second Empire, the publication of the first volume of the *Rougon-Macquart* series, the founding of the German Empire, and the incorporation of Rome into the Italian kingdom (1984, 11) In France it seemed to be the logical continuation of the nineteenth century French tradition of realism with such writers as Balzac, Flaubert and, to a lesser extent, Stendhal. Already in 1867 Émile Zola had published a novel, later adapted for the stage, entitled *Thérèse Raquin*, in the preface of which he wrote that the "écrivain est un simple analyste qui a pu s'oublier dans la pourriture humaine, mais s'y est oublié comme un médicin s'oublie dans un amphithéâtre" (10). Zola appeals to science here; he claims that the novel is a scientific study and states later in the preface that "le reproche d'immoralité, en matière de science, ne prouve absolument rien"(10).

Whereas, in the preface to *Thérèse Raquin*, Zola justifies his practice with regard to his own novel, in his later works, such as for example in the essay *Le Roman expérimental* (1879), he gives guidelines for all writers. He stresses the idea of the scientific analogy of literature and science. The writer needs to be absolutely objective and follow as closely as possible the scientist's analysis of material. Zola's views, which in fact became the standard formula for naturalist literary theory, but were never fully observed by Zola himself or by other prominent naturalists, are expounded by himself as follows:

> Le roman expérimental est une conséquence de l'évolution scientifique du siècle; il continue et complète la physiologie ... il substitue à l'étude de l'homme abstrait, de l'homme métaphysique, d'étude de l'homme naturel, soumis aux lois physio-chimiques et déterminé par les influences du milieu. (qtd. by Furst and Skrine 29-30)

Although, as we have already established, a literary movement cannot be identified with one single writer, not even so prominent a writer as Zola, his theories had such an impact on contemporary writers that the English critic E. Gosse feels compelled to say in the American review *Forum* in 1890:

> It is to Zola, and to Zola only, that the concentration of the scattered tendencies of naturalism is due. It is owing to him that the threads of Flaubert and Daudet, Dostoiefsky and Tolstoi; Howells and Henry James can be drawn into anything like a single system. It is Zola who discovered a common measure for all their talents, and a formula wide enough and yet close enough to distinguish them from the outside world and bind them to one another. (qtd. by Becker 386)

Of all forms of literature, drama can be said to be the most conservative and slow to change because of its particular conventions. Bigsby claims that this is due to the fact that "the theatre is a collaborative exercise that requires a concerted decision as to the acceptability of the new" (8). On the subject of the conservative nature of drama Alphonse Appia states the following:

> The theatre has always been bound strictly by the special conditions imposed by the age, and consequently, the dramatist has always been the least independent of artists, because he employs so many distinct elements all of which must be properly united in his work. If one of the elements remains subject to the conventions of the age, while the others free themselves to obey the will of the creative artist, the result will be a lack of balance which alters the essential nature of the dramatic work (9).

We see this tendency to change at a slow pace when we examine the movement of naturalism in the theatre. Whereas naturalism had established itself in the novel as early as the 1870s, the new ideas were not as easily imported into the theatre. Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century such playwrights as Dumas *fils*, Augier and Sardou in France had advocated the notion of the so-called "*pièce-bien-faite*," with its strict conventions and particular restrictions. In Europe naturalism in the theatre was only gaining ground in the late nineteenth century. By then the naturalist playwrights started to revolt against the artificiality of the established theatre by experimenting with more modern and contemporary forms of drama.

The influence of Zola on the new naturalist ideas was clearly noticeable in the drama after the publication of *Le Naturalisme au théâtre* (1881). In this essay he stresses his disregard for form, which is only of secondary importance to him, inferior to the "scientific" depiction of *milieu*. However, it was not so much the production of *Thérèse Raquin* and the publication of *Le Naturalisme au théâtre* that had an immediate effect on dramatic practice in France as the *Théâtre Libre*, which was established by André Antoine in 1887 and dedicated itself to Zola's principles. Antoine, a clerk in the Paris Gas Company, was pivotal in the organization of the new theatre. He provided a stage for unknown young playwrights from France, such as Eugène Brieux and Henri Becque, and also introduced such modern foreign writers as Ibsen, Hauptmann, Strindberg and Heijermans. Antoine's initiative, which eventually gave naturalism the dominant role in European drama, inspired many other "free theatres" all over Europe, for example in Berlin (Freie Bühne, 1889), London (Independent Theatre, 1891) and Moscow (Moscow Art Theatre, 1898). In Antoine's *Théâtre Libre* the old views of drama soon became more and more outdated and were in the end replaced by the new notions promoted by the naturalists. In the new theatres different stage-settings and lighting effects were introduced and new kinds of plays were performed, in which the emphasis was placed on *milieu*. Bigsby quotes Antoine as saying that "it is the environment that determines the movement of the characters, not the movements of the characters that determine the environment" (3).

Although it is commonly, and rightly, assumed that the driving force of the naturalist theatre came from France, signs of change in the theatre had already been plainly in evidence outside of France even before the new literary movement had won its victory there. Flaxman indicates that in Germany Hebbel and Ludwig had introduced a "realistic note" in their dramas, and Anzengruber in Austria, Björnson in Norway, and Strindberg in Sweden were forerunners of a new kind of drama that eventually changed the face of the European theatre. However, it was the Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen who very decisively made way for the new theatre and drama of the age. Ibsen was an innovator in that he wrote about the problems of the middle-class society in Norway and highlighted the social traditions of the bourgeoisie, pointing to the weaknesses of contemporary society (Flaxman 1954, 2). In his so-called "problem dramas" he deals with legal or illegal situations which are posing a problem to society. Ibsen hopes to provoke the reactions and prejudices of his audience and counts on the fact that, out of indignation or reforming zeal, the audience will react in a complex and violent way. Ibsen had already made fun of bourgeois marriage conventions in his *Kjærligheden komedie*, published as early as 1862 (first translated into English as *Love's Comedy* in 1900). In the years to come he would aim the spotlight at the social stereotypes of his time, starting with *Samfundets støtter* (1877; *Pillars of Society*, 1888) and ending with *Hedda Gabler* (1890; English, 1891), which shocked conservative audiences all over the theatrical world. Flaxman calls Ibsen's most influential plays in Europe *Ett dukkehjem* (1879; *A Doll's House*, 1882) and *Gengangere* (1881; *Ghosts*, 1885), in which Ibsen examines the position of the modern woman in marriage and speculates "on the meaning of the recently discovered laws of heredity. Thus he broke down the barriers of dramatic convention for the naturalists, who were to treat these subjects as their very own" (1954, 4).

In *Herman Heijermans en de vernieuwing van het Europese drama* Evert de Jong classifies the new type of drama that swept over Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a movement towards the so-called "static drama," a term first introduced in the phrase *théâtre statique*, referring to Maurice Maeterlinck's dramas *L'Intruse* (*The Intruder*, 1890), *Les Aveugles* (*The Blind*, 1890) and *Intérieur* (1894; *Interior*, 1904). A static drama portrays a permanent situation out of which there is no escape, as opposed to the old "development drama," which depicts the unfolding of a particular situation and character, such as the drama practised by the French playwrights of the nineteenth century. The most important difference between the two types of drama according to de Jong is the ultimate goal of the playwright and therefore the set-up of the play. In the static drama the action becomes less important in favour of the depiction of the situation, such as in Ibsen's *Ghosts*. The naturalists were an integral part of this new type of drama. They were not so much concerned with the development of a certain situation, as with man being determined by his *milieu* and heredity, which resulted in plays in which the emphasis is not on the action in general, but on the representation of the characters' environment (4-7).

Especially in Germany the new, young playwrights were very much concerned with the depiction of *milieu*. They called it *Milieuschilderung*, which Furst and Skrine describe as "the meticulous description of stage-sets" (66). In October 1889 the *Freie Bühne* in Berlin staged *Vor Sonnenaufgang* (*Before Daybreak*, 1889) by Gerhart Hauptmann, who was to become the leader of the naturalist movement in the German drama. In this play Hauptmann does not depict characters from the middle-class, but mainly from the proletariat, which is intended to fulfil the naturalist idea of portraying the workings of society through the lower classes. In 1893 Hauptmann's *Die Weber* (*The Weavers*, 1892) was produced in Berlin. The production of this play was very important for the naturalist drama. Hauptmann gives up the rigorous structure of the traditional dramatic technique in favour of a looser plot construction, the main objective of which is to bring facts or states of affair to the urgent notice of the rest of society. This was the drama Zola had intended. In true naturalist fashion, Hauptmann does not depict a single hero, but social groups are his protagonists; there is no traditional plot, and, as Furst and Skrine point out, "speech seems to emerge from the characters themselves" (66). The play is written largely in Hauptmann's approximation of the Silesian dialect, reproduced in a phonetically realistic rendering, which was prompted by Germany's relative lack of linguistic unity. Starting with *Die Weber* there seemed to develop an unavoidable need among naturalists to include the representation of dialect in any production in order to give a genuine portrayal of a "slice of life" upon the stage.

Although on the European continent the naturalist movement was now being embraced as a necessary step toward the innovation of the theatre, in the United Kingdom the response was rather different. In his article "Naturalism and the English Theatre" Edward McInnes indicates that the reaction to the new naturalist impulses was quite violent in London and the rest of Britain, most likely because there had not been a very strong realist theatrical tradition in the United Kingdom in the earlier nineteenth century. Moreover, it seems that the English mind — as much as British society — traditionally shies away from extremes. The English critics disapproved of anything "barbaric" and dismissed naturalist writing for delighting in "ugliness for its own sake" and the "detailed depiction of aspects of human existence" (198). However, soon the English critics could not escape the implications of the changes in the theatre which had so deeply affected the theatre in the rest of Europe, especially since such writers as Bernard Shaw and Henry James were very enthusiastic about the new ideas. English writers and critics started to undertake the study of foreign plays and gradually became convinced that new impulses for the English drama could only come from abroad. They began to appreciate the revolt of the naturalists against the symmetry and artificial completeness of the traditional drama and started to experiment radically with form. Looking at plays by such writers as Hauptmann and Gorky, the English critics realized that the current form of theatre needed to be changed from the old emphasis on a "star performer" to a more flexible dramatic production which stressed the effects of the play as a whole. The English playwrights gradually moved away from the *pièce-bien-faite* to freedom from constrictions. Art was no longer regarded as symmetry, but as "study of life" without a preconceived pattern, so that it could reproduce the organic movement of life.

The outburst of experimental theatre which had been of so much importance in Europe in the late nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries was long in reaching the United States. Similar to England, the movement of realism had not been very strong in the United States. In Europe Ibsen was already a classic and it was more than twenty years ago that Bernard Shaw had created the new drama in England. However, in the United States the naturalist movement did not really catch on until 1912 when a number of independent theatres were founded in New York and Massachusetts, in which the new plays from Europe, which could not find an audience with the more conventional Broadway managers and public, were performed. When naturalism finally did reach the American literature and the stage, after the New York Stage Company was set up in 1912, "it found a group of people who combined a studied aesthetic eclecticism with a conviction that drama could have a central role in cultural and social life" (Bigsby vii).

Furst and Skrine claim that in the United States naturalism was closely linked to social and economic changes. The rapidly changing societal circumstances resulted in considerable discontent with the American dream of success, prosperity and happiness, reflected in writings about the difficult struggle of the poor and the troubles brought about by industrialization (33-34).

Murphy points out that there was a significant difference between the European naturalist movement and its American counterpart (xi). First of all, American naturalism was not so much a movement as a matter of groups of individual playwrights, belonging to different generations, who participated in the contemporary intellectual life. The writers were drawn together by their common view that no formal limitations should be imposed on plays, to make it possible to interpret contemporary life freely and imaginatively. The loose structure of the writers who adhered to the new theories resulted in the long life that the naturalist ideas seem to have had in the United States. Moreover, American naturalism had a stronger tendency toward the aesthetic, whereas the European movement was more socially involved in that it dealt with the social reality of the time (Murphy xi). Naturalism in the United States tried to give a representation of the subject matter creating an *illusion* of reality on the stage, which was reflected in theatrical techniques, stage directions and stage-settings. As the famous American theatre producer David Belasco put it:

> Everything must be real. I have seen plays in which thrones creaked on which monarchs sat, and palace walls flapped when persons touched them. Nothing so destructive to *illusion* or so ludicrous can happen on my stage (qtd. by Bigsby 3; emphasis mine).

When finally the Washington Square Players, the Provincetown Theater, Eugene O'Neill (1888-1953) and Maxwell Anderson (1888-1959) made their appearance, American drama and theatre achieved a new significance, which, by the time of World War II, had changed the face of American drama in the true naturalist sense.

In the Netherlands, just as in the surrounding countries in Europe, the new developments in the drama of the late nineteenth century were of great importance to what was to follow. The Dutch critics were still very much looking abroad for the new kind of drama. In the 1880s and 1890s the works of Ibsen, Strindberg, Tolstoy, Hauptmann and other leading European dramatists were performed in the Netherlands. The innovations seen in the new theatre of the time made the theatre-going public also pay attention to new native Dutch talents, such as Marcellus Emants, Frederik van Eeden and Herman Heijermans, who was the most outstanding and popular of them all. Debbaut tells us that the Dutch naturalists showed great interest in the psychology of the individual placed in his environment or *milieu*. Although many Dutch naturalist writers, such as Couperus, Emants and Robbers, were primarily preoccupied with the depiction of corruption among the bourgeoisie, others like Querido and Heijermans showed more interest in the lower classes and produced, what the Germans call, *Armeleutepoesie*. As a general theme of Dutch naturalism Debbaut mentions social relations, and in particular the impossibility of real communication, which finds its practical application in the description of the decadence of the upper classes and the crudeness of the victims of social and hereditary circumstances, living as the underclasses (1983, 107-11).

Before the movement of naturalist drama took root in the Netherlands, the French drama of intrigue had been the model for the Dutch theatre. Flaxman points out that the only opposition to the doctrine of the *pièce-bien-faite* before the turn of the century was enunciated by the *Beweging van tachtig* (Movement of Eighty) in its magazine *De nieuwe gids* (The New Guide). This literary movement was headed by such writers as Kloos and Verwey, who followed foreign trends initiated by Keats, Shelley and Verlaine. The *Tachtigers* (Eightiers), as they were popularly called, tried to break the established literary traditions by revolting against the old ideas. As Flaxman puts it:

> They struggled to throw off the dead weight of the past, to remove the stiff

> overlay of hackneyed phrases and empty rhetoric. The young rebels banded together to depose those who held their positions in the world of literature merely by nodding benignly over imitations of imitations, and they sought to replace the false and artificial with the true and natural (1954, 10).

Unfortunately, the only dramatist in the *Beweging van tachtig* was Frederik van Eeden, who produced *De student thuis* (The Student at Home) in 1885. Later, however, the group adopted an art for art's sake mentality, so that the approximation of "natural" language and social criticism were only introduced to the stage later in Herman Heijermans' plays.

Herman Heijermans Jr. was born in Rotterdam on 3 December 1864, the son of a journalist. He developed a literary interest early in life through his parents, who, however, did not encourage him to pursue a literary career, but made him obtain a position with a bank. After two failed attempts at business, which proved to be a major turning point in his life because of what he experienced in that environment, he became a journalist and short-story writer. In 1892 Heijermans moved to Amsterdam, where he became a theatre critic for the newspaper *De Telegraaf* (The Telegraph), which acquainted him with the practical aspects of theatre production. His move to Amsterdam did not only change his personal life, but also his literary allegiance. Always looking for his own literary style, Heijermans was experimenting with different formal techniques. Very soon he came under the influence of the *Nieuwe gids* school, and was influenced by its emphasis on language and use of words in a new manner and in new contexts. In Amsterdam he also joined the socialist party, in which he found an ally for his opposition to the status quo and a "framework for expressing his anger toward the immorality and inhumanity of the economic and political system" (Knetsch 78). Heijermans' socialist attitude to life was to show later in his works.

In 1893 Louis Crispijn founded *De nederlandsche tooneel vereeniging* (The Netherlands Theatre Association), which was devoted to modern drama. This theatre company gave Herman Heijermans the chance to experiment and produce a new type of drama. Heijermans' first play was entitled *Dora Kremer* (1893) and was not well-received in the Netherlands. When his second play *Ahasverus* (1893) was produced, Heijermans decided to use the Russian pseudonym of Ivan Jelakovitch and the play became an instant success. While Heijermans aired his frustration about the contemporary situation of dramatic criticism in the Netherlands in *De Telegraaf*,[4] Schilp relates the reception of the plays to the quality of Heijermans' work. He calls *Dora Kremer* a weak imitation of Ibsen, but *Ahasverus*, he claims, is an excellent piece of naturalist drama (15).

In his plays Heijermans developed his own specific technique, combining the new foreign ideas with a traditional Dutch style to produce his highly individualistic art. Flaxman points out that it is impossible to classify Heijermans as a strictly naturalist writer. He was inspired by the new movements he saw happening around him, and he adapted what seemed best to him in the new ideas, moulding everything into his own specific method (1954, 13). The socialist Heijermans did not retreat in theories nor did he withdraw from the world. Although Heijermans adopted the naturalist technique in order to reproduce an exact and detailed *Milieuschilderung*, he was still very much interested in individual character and showed great love for life. He was an engaged writer, who revolted against the existing social order trying to evoke by means of his literature the change of the social structure in society. He looked upon the oppressed and exploited with compassion and used his dramas to express his sympathy. Through his works he tried to examine the unfortunate circumstances of the working class, as we see in the novel *Diamantstad* (1904; Diamond City) and the play *Op hoop van zegen* (1900; *The Good Hope*, 1903).

Heijermans did not like the way the theatre was run in the Netherlands. He found that the theatre was in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who only supported plays that suited their own needs. In 1898 Heijermans founded *De jonge gids* (The Young Guide), in which he tried to spread the message of socialism. Due to his wide knowledge, both of society and of the theatre, Heijermans became a unique playwright, novelist and journalist. Through his engaged writing he supported the workers' cause. He was an idealist in that he chose to support his characters in their struggle against oppression, pressure and old-fashioned relations, and a naturalist in that he depicted his characters in their own natural environment.

---

[4] Heijermans wrote: "Would anyone have taken notice of the Russian drama if it had been announced as *Ahasverus* by H.H. jr? Wouldn't everyone have prejudged the performance had it been known that a young Dutchman had written it? ... This mystification was necessary because 'something is rotten in the state' of Dutch newspaper criticism" (qtd. by Knetsch 76).

In 1907 Heijermans moved to Berlin because of insufficient copy-right protection in the Netherlands. When he returned to Amsterdam in 1912 he founded his own theatre company, which was dissolved in 1922. His most important plays are *Ghetto* (1898; first translated into English in 1899), *Het zevende gebod* (1899; *The Seventh Commandment*, 1899), *Op hoop van zegen* (1900; *The Good Hope*, 1903), *Allerzielen* (1904; *All Souls*, 1904), *De opgaande zon* (1908; *The Rising Sun*, 1926) and *De wijze kater* (1918; *The Wise Tomcat*, 1918). Herman Heijermans died in Zandvoort on 22 November 1924. Of his plays, which were not only performed in his native country, but also became popular on stages outside of the Netherlands, *Op hoop van zegen* was the most successful, as we shall see in our discussion of the reception of its English translations in the United Kingdom and the United States. Although it was not always appreciated by critics for its lack of "good taste," the English translations of *Op hoop van zegen* were ultimately regarded extremely favourably and constituted an important vehicle in the European push for renewal of the theatre at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, which slowly trickled through to the English and American theatre.

Chapter 4: RECEPTION OF *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN* AND ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS[5]

Op hoop van zegen was first produced in Amsterdam by the *Nederlandsche toneel vereeniging* (Netherlands Theatre Association) on December 24, 1900. Critical opinion, as Knetsch points out, differed in the Netherlands (28-51). J.H. Rössing, a prominent theatre critic, was "not impressed" with *Op hoop van zegen*, when he reviewed it in 1900 (29).[6] However, immediately after its first performance *Op hoop van zegen* became such a great success with the public that within the first few months after the first production the play had already been performed over a hundred times (134-36). Time made Rössing change his opinion. Fifteen years later he wrote a more appreciative article about Heijermans and *Op hoop van zegen*, in which he stated that Kniertje had become one of the eternal symbols of Dutch literature (Knetsch 30).

Popular on the Dutch stage, *Op hoop van zegen* also became a renowned play on stages outside of the Netherlands and was translated into languages such as English, French, German and Russian. Flaxman informs us that it was performed in Berlin, Prague, Moscow, Vienna, Antwerp and Paris, where it was produced by André Antoine. In the London theatre the famous British actress Ellen Terry played the leading role of Kniertje in 1904. She was also the one who took the play to New York on one of her American engagements. Later *Op hoop van zegen* was produced in Stockholm, Copenhagen, Jerusalem and in Japan (1954, 95). An operatic version of the play was composed in 1907 by Charles Grelinger and, in addition, filmic interpretations were produced in 1918, 1924, 1934 and 1985. The play has also been produced on Dutch television, and is very popular with amateur theatre groups throughout the country

---

[5] Although, as indicated in the text, for some of the critical material dealing with the reception of *Op hoop van zegen* and its English translations I rely on Knetsch's discussion and evaluation, the majority of the information in this chapter is derived from my own research into primary sources.

[6] In Rössing's opinion the third act was too long and too sombre, and simply not theatre. Moreover, he claimed that *Op Hoop van Zegen* did not provide the performers with an opportunity to create exceptional or memorable characterizations (Knetsch 29).

(Knetsch 138-39).

As both de Jong and Flaxman (1954) remark, parallels between *Op hoop van zegen* and Henrik Ibsen's *Samfundets støtter* (1877; *Pillars of Society*, 1888) have often been pointed out. Evert de Jong mentions the common motive of the leaky vessels, which are both termed "floating coffins" (53). However, Ibsen and Heijermans make use of different dramatic techniques. Ibsen is the master of character and takes the standpoint of the critic of society who believes in truth and freedom for the individual. He depicts Bernick and his family in his comfortable home, stressing the danger of building a society on a rotten moral foundation. Heijermans, on the other hand, is the genre painter and the socialist critic of capitalist society, and is more concerned with the fishermen as a group and their families in their struggle against the sea and unscrupulous shipowners (Flaxman 1954, 218-20). Moreover, whereas Ibsen's Consul Bernick knows that the "Gazelle" will go down, Heijermans' Bos is not sure. Heijermans does not exclusively seem to blame the individual shipowner for the tragedy, but the whole society in which it is possible that such things take place (de Jong 54).

Similarly, *Op hoop van zegen* has been compared with Gerhart Hauptmann's *Die Weber* (*The Weavers*, 1892). As de Jong points out, both plays were meant to protest the meagre living conditions of the proletariat. Van Neck Yoder is of the same opinion as de Jong. She claims that both *Die Weber* and *Op hoop van zegen* come to a "similar conclusion about the relationship of capital and labour." Moreover, she observes that "in both plays, activism is rejected in favor of the salvation which lies in man's hearts and expresses itself by endurance" (qtd. by Knetsch 26). Yet, the difference between the plays, as de Jong suggests in his comparative analysis of the two, lies in the fact that Hauptmann places emphasis on the action from complaint to revolt, while Heijermans is primarily concerned with the description of *milieu* (55). Another important difference between the plays indicated by de Jong is the fact that Hauptmann explicitly mentions the names of the places where the action takes place. Heijermans, on the other hand, does not use any specific place names in order not to connect the play to a particular place and a certain group of fishermen, but to the tragic fate of the fisherman in his relation to the sea in general (59-60). As the reviewer in *The New York Times* (May 10, 1903) points out, the "play is in construction not so much a drama as a series of more or less dramatic sketches of different phrases of the same theme, the cruelty of the fate whereby the lives of men are sacrificed in coffinships, and the anguish of the women who are left behind" (25).

Although in the Netherlands *Op hoop van zegen* was a great success with the general public, the play in its translations encountered fierce criticism, especially in England. The first English translation, entitled *The Good Hope* appeared as early as 1903 and was produced by Christopher St. John, a pseudonym for Christabel Marshall. It was first performed by the Stage Society in the Imperial Theatre in London on April 24, 1903 with Rosina Filippi in the role of Kniertje and Harley Granville Barker as Barend.

As we read in *The Oxford Companion to the Theatre*, the Incorporated Stage Society, as the theatre company was officially called, was founded by Frederick Whelen in 1899 as a successor to Grein's Independent Theatre. The Stage Society mainly performed modern plays which were not given a licence for public performance and therefore could not be performed in the conventional theatres. The Stage Society's first production was Bernard Shaw's *You Never Can Tell*, after which followed the performance of many new plays by authors such as Hauptmann, Gorky, Tolstoi, Pirandello and Heijermans. The Stage Society functioned for 40 years, closing only after the production of some 200 plays, "many of them first performances of American and foreign plays in England" (789). It closed in 1939, when it was no longer unique and its role had largely been taken over by the Group Theatre and the Gate Theatre.

As was already mentioned, the English taste in the beginning of the twentieth century did not favour the new trends in theatre, but still very much leaned towards the conventional. McInnes points out that

> the influx of Naturalist plays into England [...] took place in a critical atmosphere largely hostile to the theoretical claims which precede them. Surveying the extended period of their introduction to the English public, one

> cannot really speak of a general acclimatisation to the material, manner or mood of the naturalist theatre (198).

Although there were mixed reactions to *The Good Hope* in England, which were dependent on the critics' attitudes toward the naturalist drama, the general opinion was rather negative. What the critics objected to in the play was the glorification of "gruesome" details, which "would be much better taken for granted or left to the imagination" (*The Observer*, May 3, 1903: 7) and the explicitness with which human existence was depicted. Max Beerbohm describes the English taste in his article in *The Saturday Review* (May 2, 1903) on the Stage Society's performance of *The Good Hope* as follows:

> True, the play was a tragedy, and a very horrible one at that. But I do not see how it could produce a feeling of dreariness, and could fail to produce a definitely tonic effect, on any person capable of intelligent aesthetic pleasure. One salient defect of the average Englishman is that he is incapable of such pleasure. If a work of art remind him of cheerful things in real life, he is exhilarated; if of cheerless things, he is downcast. The reminder of cheerful things may be dully given. That does not matter to him. The reminder of cheerless things may be given beautifully, strongly, and therefore joyously. That does not matter to him. For he was born inartistic (548-49).

Beerbohm, in the same article, praises Heijermans for his portrayal of ordinary fishing folk and dramatic technique. The writer for *The Era* (May 2, 1903), on the other hand, feels that "an ordinary English audience would never tolerate the air of gloom which envelops all the characters and has a most depressing effect." He calls everything "exaggerated and over-accentuated" and claims that "the picture may be true to life, but [it] is too sombre and sad to please the average man or woman" (13).

The Times and *The Daily Telegraph* condemn Heijermans for his open depiction of the "'naked ugliness' of misery and degradation" (qtd. by McInnes 198). The writer in *The Times* (April 28, 1903) calls *The Good Hope* a play which is strong enough to stand the "hideous message" it conveys. However, "Heijermans cares nothing for the rules. He takes whatever comes to hand, no matter whether it touch his plot or not, so long as it will help to drive home the reality of the hideous things he has to say." While the reviewer feels that Heijermans is being crude in this "grim, ghastly, brutal and deadly serious" play, he praises it for the power of the "amazing third act," which, he claims, "alone would justify the production of the play, and such a production as it received at the hands of the Stage Society" (4).

The critic in *The Athenaeum* (May 2, 1903) cannot see any merit in the play at all. He calls *The Good Hope* "the dullest and most lachrymose that the management has succeeded in discovering. [...] Nothing we can recall in Ibsen is so morbid as 'The Good Hope,' and nothing with which we are familiar in Zola is more grossly realistic. Regarded as art, moreover, the work seems unworthy of consideration, and the story can only be taken seriously if it is regarded as a political disquisition." He refers to the third act as a "series of funereal recitations," which made him feel "as we were expected to interest ourselves in a sort of Decameron of gloom." He cannot find any imagination in this "grim" play; what he sees is "nothing but the most common-place and flat realism" (572).

The reviewer for *The Illustrated London News* (May 2, 1903), on the other hand, praises Heijermans' realism by stating that he captured "perfectly, impressively, the atmosphere of a Dutch fishing village wherein 'men must work and women must weep.'" He claims that, although the play has its technical defects, "the atmosphere, the environment of peasant poverty and anxiety and grief, of peasant bereavement and resignation and dulled sensibility, [...] wonderfully reproduced by the author," makes the audience forget the faults (653).

In 1904 and 1905 *The Good Hope*, in the translation of Christopher St. John, was produced in the English provinces and the London suburbs by actress Ellen Terry, who starred herself in the role of Kniertje. It was Terry who took the play to New York in

1907, when she came to the United States for a three-week engagement. In New York the critical reaction to *The Good Hope*, which was performed at the Empire Theatre eight times beginning on February 11, 1907, was also divided.[7] The critic for the *New York Daily Tribune* (Feb. 12, 1907) called the play "one of the most dreary compositions that the baleful example of Mr. Ibsen has yet caused to be inflicted upon human patience" (qtd. by Flaxman 1952, 134).

However, *The New York Times* (Feb. 12, 1907) was more appreciative and calls *The Good Hope* "well worth seeing," because "unlike most sermon plays, this one is interesting. Heijermans knows how to stir the pulse; he has the realist's sense of character and of incident, together with a force of cumulative detail" (9). *The New York Times* (Feb. 17, 1907) contained another review of the play about a week later in which the same admiration for *The Good Hope* was expressed. The critic writes that "the skill with which the narrative is told and its color and characterization combine to make a play remarkable in effect. It is at times descriptive rather than dramatic, but on the whole it presents a moving study of a socialistic conflict. And the preaching is natural to the characters and the situations" (2). Similarly, the *New York Dramatic Mirror* (Feb. 23, 1907) said: "What is best of all is the poetry swinging through the lines, the poetry of the sea, the poetry that more than all else symbolizes the inevitableness of fate" (qtd. by Shipley 303).

Ellen Terry again played the role of Kniertje in *The Good Hope* on November 3, 1912 with the Pioneer Players at the King's Hall in London. At this point the English critics and audience were more accustomed to the new naturalist theatre, which resulted in a considerably more appreciative critical opinion. We find this reflected in the reviews of the performance. John Palmer writes in *The Saturday Review* (Nov. 9, 1912) that "Heijermans is a very remarkable dramatist." He calls *The Good Hope* a "very excellent play," in which "we are lifted to the level of great drama" (577). Palmer remarks that

---

[7] Although Heijermans' plays have been performed in many other cities and theatres all over the United States, the New York stage, because of its special position in the American theatre, will give us insight into the reception of *The Good Hope* in the United States and into the workings of the cultural exchange.

"even in his propagandistic scenes of 'Marseillaise' and syndicalism for the Navy [Heijermans] is steadily above the false values of the theatre. The full-close of his history is admirable. Irony rings down the curtain. There is no sentimental paltering with truth at the finish. All the clichés of the customary last Act are omitted — in fact, the hardened English theatre-goer is conceivably more astonished at the things (the inevitable, customary things) which do not happen in the Fourth Act of 'The Good Hope' than at the things which do" (577).

In the *Academy* (Nov. 9, 1912) the reviewer praises Heijermans for "some excellent scenes," but doubts "whether the theme of the story is likely to appeal very greatly to English audiences at the present day." He points out that in England "insurance companies are now too astute to insure unseaworthy ships of unscrupulous shipowners, and merchants are not bent upon sending their employees to their doom in a 'floating coffin' such as 'The Good Hope'" (608).

On October 18, 1927 *The Good Hope* was again produced in New York, this time in a translation by Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink. The play was performed by the Civic Repertory Theatre under the direction of Eva LeGallienne. In *American Theatre Companies 1888-1930* we find that this theatre company was founded in 1926 by actress Eva LeGallienne, whose goal it was "to provide the best in the theatre at the lowest possible rate, i.e.: Good plays, good acting and good productions" (Durham 81).

Most of the plays performed by the Civic Repertory Theatre were modern classics by such playwrights as Ibsen, Chekhov and Shaw, who had all become popular in the European theatre in previous years. However, LeGallienne's company also produced plays by Shakespeare, Molière and Rostand, and did not exclude the works of new American women playwrights, such as Susan Glaspell and Eleanor Holmes Hinkley. LeGallienne maintained her goal of repertory for ten seasons, in which she managed to develop a loyal audience made up of "students, secretaries, shopkeepers, and clerks," who were attracted by constant low admission prices (Durham 83). In the end, however, she encountered massive financial problems, which ultimately led to the demise of the Civic Repertory Theatre in 1936.

When *The Good Hope* was performed in New York this time, the critical reaction was largely positive, owing to the fact that the theatre-going public was by now acquainted with the naturalist style of writing and had grown accustomed to naturalist plays. The majority of reviewers are enthusiastic about the Civic Repertory Theatre's performance of *The Good Hope*. In *The Saturday Review* (Nov. 5, 1927), Oliver M. Sayler calls attention to "the general excellence of the interpretation of "The Good Hope" by Miss LeGallienne's company" (275-76), while J. Brooks Atkinson in *The New York Times* (Oct. 19, 1927) refers to the presentation as a "magnificent performance" (24). Similarly, in *The Outlook* (Nov. 16, 1927) Eva LeGallienne is praised for her genius as a producer and her contribution to "intelligent entertainment" (341). The same article is very appreciative of the naturalist style of writing employed by Heijermans in *The Good Hope*. A critic with the initials F.R.B. claims that "from the technical standpoint, it is the essence of realism. Had Sinclair Lewis been a Dutchman and possessed of Galworthy's ability to assess the true values of human character, even he would have found it difficult to equal observation and realistic detail" (341). J. Brooks Atkinson (*The New York Times*, Oct. 23, 1927) shares the same positive attitude with regard to Heijermans' ability as a playwright. He writes that "after enjoying the rude poetry of fishermen in "The Good Hope" one inevitably feels dissatisfied with the prosy invention of trick dramas and their preoccupation with common-place people and themes. "Porgy," and "Four Walls," [...] "Springboard," set humanity before us; and, of course, Ibsen's "An Enemy of the People" slaps us in the face with a cruelly honest idea. Now "The Good Hope" may be recommended for its refulgent character portraits" (VIII, 1).

The critics agree that *The Good Hope* is most of all "a drama of character — of mariners old and young, of women left at home, of fears and catastrophes, of coarse humors and jollifications." *The New York Times* (Oct. 23, 1927) even claims that it reveals "a more complete understanding of human character than any other play in town" (VIII, 1).

Critic Stark Young (*New Republic*, Nov. 2, 1927) calls *The Good Hope* "a trifle old-fashioned now," because of its sobriety and insistence of length, which do not "add to the tragedy or [...] deepen its spell on the imagination" (285). J. Brooks Atkinson (*The New York Times*, Oct. 19, 1927) also recognizes this fact when he writes that *The Good Hope* "may seem a bit leisurely in the last two acts for our brisk modern manners" (24). Naturally, the play might also be regarded as outmoded in subject matter in the year 1927, since it was Heijermans' intention to put forward the flagrant abuses of the seafaring regulations of the Netherlands around the turn of the century, which were repaired as early as 1909.

In *The Saturday Review* (Nov. 5, 1927), Oliver M. Sayler calls the play "negligible today as a protest against the callous exchange of human souls on waterlogged wooden luggers for fish and profits." However, he does see merit in "its vividness as a Dutch *genre* painting come to life, its distinctive atmosphere, its evocation of a series of moods." He explains that it is the quality of deep knowledge of human nature and respect for the integrity of the drama that led "propagandistic" playwrights such as Heijermans to write truthfully, significantly and dispassionately, and preserved their work beyond its immediate occasion (275-76).

It is remarkable that of the numerous reviews of the different performances of the translations of *Op hoop van zegen* that have been located, only one comments on the translation as such and on Heijermans' use of language.[8] The majority of reviews of the performance concentrate on the dramatic effectiveness of the play and on Heijermans' ability as a playwright. The tendency of the British and American theatre critics to ignore the translated text as such is indirectly confirmed by Knetsch, who, in his dissertation, does not mention comments about the translations made by theatre critics. The reviewer in *The Stage* (Apr. 30, 1903), however, writes that "the translation, let it be written, the attempt to reproduce the slangy colloquialisms of low life in Holland was productive of much in the dialogue that was aggressively offensive to the sensibility of the average English playgoer. The cordial reception the play received from a large audience, which included many distinguished members of the profession, must be attributed to the excellent acting of the performers" (11). Why the other reviewers did not pick up on this aspect remains to be discussed in chapter 5, in which Heijermans' use of language and its representations in the translations will be examined.

---

[8] I have examined some 28 reviews of the performances of the English translations of *Op hoop van zegen*. See selected bibliography for details.

In conclusion, it may be argued that *Op hoop van zegen,* both in the original and in the translations, was of considerable importance to the new theatre of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Although the play was not always appreciated by all, owing to Heijermans' adherence to naturalist principles and socialist views, its theatrical quality and excellence are undeniable. While, as some critics claim, *The Good Hope* originated in one of the "deadest of dead periods," in which "every social wrong was considered to constitute *per se* the materials of a drama" (Joseph Wood Krutch in *The Nation*, Nov. 2, 1927: 486), in the play Heijermans manages to transcend the limits of this mode through his gift for character drawing. As Krutch puts it, *Op hoop van zegen* "has life in it and it will not take its place quietly upon the shelf with the other documents for the study of an outmoded school" (*The Nation*, Nov. 2, 1927: 486).

Chapter 5: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN*

Following the polysystem point of view, we may claim, along with Knetsch, that "Herman Heijermans was very much a product of the turbulent, idealistic times during which he produced his finest dramatic work. The experiences of his life as well as the social, economic, and political atmosphere of his day shaped his philosophy and guided his writing" (94). It is not difficult to discover signs of the trend of the times in Heijermans' writing. Having adopted the naturalist method for the exact and detailed reproduction of *milieu*, Heijermans attempts to approximate the life and people of Holland in all their strengths and weaknesses in his dramatic works. *Op hoop van zegen* can be called the best play that the socialist Heijermans wrote for the workers' cause. The characters are earthy, poorly educated, and show little refinement in social behaviour or language. Heijermans succeeds in making the tragic figure of Kniertje to be extremely persuasive. Through her he brings the cause of the fishermen before his audience, thereby serving the Dutch workers' movement.

Heijermans had always been concerned with the plight of the societal underdog and was specifically involved in the cause of the fisherman, as is shown by an 1898 article he wrote for *De nieuwe tijd*, which called into question the bad conditions in the fishing industry and the lack of compensation for the families of drowned fishermen. Heijermans knew the plight of the fisherman extremely well, because he had lived in the North Sea coastal villages of Katwijk-aan-Zee, Wijk-aan-Zee, Scheveningen and Zandvoort for the latter part of the 1890s, during which he had seen the amount of suffering that went on in the fishing industry. Through his life among fishermen, Heijermans also became acquainted with their dialect and gained a first-hand knowledge of the speech they used.

Flaxman (1954) indicates that in England the cause of the fishermen had been brought to the attention of the general public by Samuel Plimsoll, a member of Parliament, who referred to the leaky vessels in which they were sent to sea as "coffin ships," a phrase later coined by Heijermans as "*drijvende doodskisten*" (floating coffins). In England a rule of inspection had been passed by Parliament and in 1876 the Merchant

Shipping Act had been introduced (38-39). However, in the Netherlands no formal action was undertaken until Heijermans brought the matter to light in his play *Op hoop van zegen*. In 1903 a discussion in the Dutch Parliament took place in which it was pointed out that it was "the sensational drama *The Good Hope*, which gave impetus to the movement" (qtd. by Flaxman 1954, 39). Finally, in 1909 the *Schepenwet* (Ships Act) was adopted. In the United States the working conditions on American vessels were improved with the passing of the Seamen's Act of 1915, also known as the LaFollette Seamen's Bill, which laid the groundwork for all subsequent seamen legislation and provided a guarantee that humane conditions would exist on American ships (Morris 210).

As was pointed out above, Heijermans was familiar with the fishermen's speech, which is coloured by the region, the trade and the social position of the fisherman. To bring the fisherman's cause and the horrifying reality of the human sacrifices to the attention of the general public, Heijermans seeks to portray his characters in their authentic environment, with his rendering of their dialect and all. The use of dialect in literature has deep historic roots. Hodgson points out that it was used in England as early as the Elizabethan era, in which dialectal forms were often associated with comic and humorous characters (92). For example, Shakespeare uses dialect in his history plays, notably in *Henry V* (1599). Hodgson further shows that in nineteenth century English melodrama a diminishing of the comic stigma of dialect took place, which is also illustrated by the industrial and regional novels of such authors as Mrs. Gaskell and Thomas Hardy. Although in England occasionally plays were produced which contained passages of dialect, for example George Bernard Shaw's *Candida* (1895) and Irishman John Millington Synge's *The Playboy of the Western World* (1907), Hodgson claims that, in general, the London theatre was not very accessible to dialectal plays, stating that "D.H. Lawrence's serious dialect plays, such as *The Daughter in Law* (1912), waited fifty years to be produced in London" (92).

In her chapter on realism and dialect, Elsa Nettels explains that in fiction and drama which belongs to the period of realism the use of dialect is motivated by the urge to get back to the "language of life" (63). In describing American writer William Dean

Howells' view on the matter, she claims the following:

> Characters could be fully realized [...] only if they were rooted in their surroundings and shown to be the outgrowth of the conditions that have created the culture of a particular society or region. [...] If language is created by and expressive of the environment that shapes the characters, then the representation of their language becomes important in establishing the connection between characters and their circumstances (63).

European naturalists, such as Herman Heijermans, saw the same connection between language and circumstance. In Heijermans' works the detailed depiction of the *milieu* of the lower classes is closely associated with the characters' speech. Flaxman points out that

> the speech of [Heijermans'] characters harmonizes with their background. Their language is the colloquial language of every day .... He had too great a scorn for anything that smacked of literary estheticism to permit a worker or small business man to express himself in the winged words of poetry (1954, 232).

In *Op hoop van zegen* Heijermans aims to represent the regional and social dialect of the fishermen, and he sets his play, as it is stated in the *dramatis personae*, in a Dutch North Sea fishing village, the environment he had come to know relatively well. However, as mentioned before, Heijermans does not specify in which particular coastal town the action takes place. In the play, Heijermans uses language as the basic vehicle of the cultural identity of the average Dutch fisherman, which, in this case, is very closely linked to the late nineteenth, early twentieth century contemporary social order and political structure of the Netherlands. Heijermans uses this particular language to reflect the unpolished characters of the fishermen and their families. The accent approximated by Heijermans is specifically western Dutch, and, as Vivien Bosley points out with regard to the written representation of *joual*, "as soon as we see on the page this

[...] form of [...] local speech, we make various kinds of assumptions on a semiotic basis even before we know anything at all about the content of the speech" (141). Bosley names six of these assumptions, which, although they pertain to the translation of plays written in *joual*, are remarkably applicable to our case study. Our first assumption is that the speakers belong to a specific and limited linguistic group. Secondly, we know that this group is situated in a certain part of the country. Thirdly, we assume that the speakers are from a working class level of society. Our fourth assumption is that there is authorial identification with this group. Furthermore, we know the point of departure of the composition of the piece, and lastly, we know that the language is being used as a metaphor for a state of oppression (141-42). Looking at and listening to the language used in *Op hoop van zegen*, a native speaker of Dutch will immediately be able to deduce that we are dealing with characters from a working class background, who are located in the western part of the Netherlands. We can assume that Heijermans identifies with this particular group of people, since he chooses to relate their story from their own point of view.

When we consider the dialogue of the play in more depth, we find that the language used in *Op hoop van zegen* is characterized by informality, and has an extremely colloquial nature. There are many unfinished and incomplete sentences, exclamations, grammatically incorrect constructions, and words spelled as they are pronounced in the dialect, not as they are prescribed by the official orthography. In addition, we find numerous idiomatic expressions and epigrams. Words are slurred and partially run together. Moreover, Heijermans makes use of accents on syllables to indicate which one is stressed in everyday speech. The unfinished sentences are used to emphasize the informality and spontaneity of the spoken language. They give the characters' speech a colloquial nature, which largely determines the atmosphere of the play. The same can be said of the many exclamations in the text. Phrases such as *Tja*, *Pèh*, *Och* and *Hè* are typically Dutch expressions, which do not have easy equivalents in English. In general, it can be stated that Dutch has many more such utterances in the daily use of language than English, which make these phrases an integral part of Dutch speech, and a potential translational problem. Grammatically incorrect constructions are used in the play to stress, once again, the informality of the dialogue, which reflects the speech of poorly educated persons. Every effort has been made by Heijermans to make the dramatic dialogue resemble the everyday speech of the fishermen and their families as closely as possible. There are many instances of grammatical inaccuracies. A representative example of this incorrectness is Daantje's speech *Kan u mijn niet is gebruike?* (Can't you use me some time?) (6). In correct, formal or written language this sentence would look as follows: *Kunt u mij niet eens gebruiken?* The pronoun *u* (second person singular, polite form) requires the corresponding form of the verb *kunnen*, which is *kunt* and not *kan*, the first or third person singular. The use of *mijn*, the possessive pronoun of *ik*, the first person singular, instead of *mij*, the accusative, denotes a very colloquial manner of speaking which is only used by poorly educated persons living in the western parts of the Netherlands. The word *is* is a corruption of *eens* (once) in spoken language. Furthermore, the infinitive of the verb *gebruiken* is spelled as *gebruike*, without the final ending *-n*, to refer once more to the western Dutch way of speaking, in which it is customary to swallow the final letter of words ending in -en. What is interesting to note is that the more educated characters in the play, such as Bos' wife Mathilde and especially his daughter Clementine, use grammatically correct forms and speak *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* (Standard Educated Dutch).

Besides the grammatical features employed to portray the life and social circumstances of the protagonists, Heijermans uses a rather extensive number of derogatory names and profanities in the text. We find words such as *doodvreter* (parasite, 10), *ouwe brombeer*, (old grumpy bear, 11), *matroezenhoer* (sailor's whore, 22), *arme verdommeling* (poor basterd, 23), and *driedubbele schurk* (threedouble villain, 74). Moreover, there are many slang-like expressions such as *sallemanders* (30), *lazerus* (30), *sallusies* (33), *rapalje* (70), and phrases such as *met geweld vang je nog geen katterige haring* (violence will not even make you catch a bad herring) (14) and the by now proverbial *de vis wordt duur betaald* (the fish is dearly paid for) (55). In general, we can claim that Heijermans' dramatic dialogue is very revealing of the characters it portrays. It reflects their attitude toward the world in which they live, their personalities and their environment. The language used by the characters makes up an integral part of the atmosphere of the play and defines the characters and the social situation.

The fact that one of the phrases from *Op hoop van zegen* has reached the status of proverb, says a great deal about the influence of the play on the Dutch society. The title *Op hoop van zegen* itself has also become a standard expression, which is used when a person takes a risk and does not know whether the outcome will be positive or negative. As was pointed out above, the play became very popular in the Netherlands, even to such an extent that it influenced an inquiry into the conditions in the fishing industry, which eventually led to social legislation in this area. To this day the play is taught in high schools and most people are familiar with it.

We have already touched upon the critical reaction to the first production of *Op hoop van zegen* in the Netherlands. Although initially the Dutch critics were not particularly enthusiastic about Heijermans' abilities as a playwright and his dramatic technique, later critical opinion became significantly more favourable. Knetsch suggests that there followed "a consistent appreciation of [Heijermans'] theatrical skill, of his masterful dialogue and characterizations, and of his ability to capture the Dutch character in his plays" (48). It is evident that in *Op hoop van zegen* Heijermans, using the naturalist approach, which reflects the emerging literary norms of contemporary Dutch authors and institutions of the time, addresses the then current Dutch situation in the fishing industry, attempting to bring about change by focusing the attention of the Dutch audience on the appalling conditions that were prevalent in this trade around the turn of the century. There are many instances in the text of culturally determined Dutch customs, which a native audience would take for granted, but which might not be understood by foreign audiences. There are plants on the window sill, a characteristically Dutch habit. Furthermore, the characters wear wooden shoes, which are taken off inside the house. This is common knowledge for a Dutch spectator, but frequently becomes the subject of stereotypization outside of the Netherlands. The same holds true for the costumes pertaining to a fishing village at the turn of the century. Although Heijermans does not include specific stage directions with regard to costuming, to a Dutch theatre group and audience in 1900 this would not pose a problem. Clothing representative of a fishing village on the North Sea at this particular time would be familiar to the Dutch. However, this is not the case for a British or American reader or audience. In addition, Heijermans includes some typically Dutch humour, such as that in Act II when the characters gather at Kniertje's house to celebrate her birthday, and are teasing each other steadily. In general, we may claim that Heijermans has succeeded in putting a genuine slice of Dutch life on the stage with many aspects of Dutch culture and customs, which might well have been incommunicable to foreign audiences, had he not managed to let the theatrical elements of the play outweigh the unique Dutch quality.

I have not been able to discover what was the prevalent opinion in the Netherlands concerning Heijermans' use of dialectal language. The critiques reviewed do not comment on this issue specifically, nor does Knetsch go into this topic in his dissertation, which in itself probably means that this was not an issue. However, I would speculate that, considering the popularity of foreign playwrights, such as Ibsen, who, in creating characters, returned to the fidelity to the actual speech of unaffected people, and particularly Gerhart Hauptmann, who already in 1892 had published *Die Weber*, written largely in Silesian dialect, the Dutch theatre-going audience was quite familiar with the naturalist trend in drama to bring a "slice of life" on the stage, complete with the approximation of regional and social dialects. Moreover, the dialect used by Heijermans in this play is not difficult to understand for the average Dutchman, since it is a variant of the speech used in the western part of the Netherlands, which is considered to be the national standard. Therefore, it is comprehensible to audiences throughout the country.

The setting of the play in a Dutch workers' environment is also reflected in the proper names Heijermans chooses for his characters. Except for Mathilde and Clementine, the two more or less educated women in the play, the first names are simple and down-to-earth. Names like Kniertje, Geert, Cobus, Daantje, Truus, Jo, Saart and Marietje are unpretentious and considered to be good, solid Dutch names which convey a feeling of familiarity and a sense of community to a Dutch audience. Although Heijermans does not refer to a specific place name, it is clear that the environment he has created is representative of an average North Sea fishing village, which might pose a problem to the translator as far as the notion of performability is concerned.

In his dissertation Knetsch includes an elaborate evaluation of the three previous translations of *Op hoop van zegen*, in which he focuses on the quality of the translations, the alteration of the original, and grammatical usage, such as changes in syntax, colloquial speech, and retention of Dutch terms in the translations, which is the most interesting section with regard to this study. Knetsch comes to the conclusion that "all three English versions are weak and do injustice to Heijermans' work" (105), and that "none of the translators of [...] *Op hoop van zegen* were [sic][...] faithful to Heijermans" (133), which once more affirms the fact that Knetsch approaches the translations from the perspective of the theory of postulated equivalence.

The first translation of *Op hoop van zegen* discussed by Knetsch is the earliest one by Christopher St. John, which dates from 1903. St. John translated several plays by Heijermans, including *The Rising Sun* (1925) to which she wrote a preface explaining her methodology. In this preface she writes that translating Heijermans' plays is like "digging [them] out of their native Dutch with the assistance of good friends more familiar with the language than I" (qtd. by Knetsch 106). She also makes specific comments about Heijermans' use of language, observing that

> his dialogue presents great difficulties because of its fragmentary character. Words here are abbreviations of meanings, and few who have not seen a play by Heijermans on the stage can conceive how very clear and full these meanings become when the tenuous text is filled out in action (qtd. by Knetsch 102).

Judging from these comments, one would assume that Ms. St. John had some insight into Heijermans' dramatic technique. However, looking at the 1903 translation, it is difficult to discern Heijermans' specific theatrical style. The unfinished sentences are finished in this version, the exclamations are left out, and the characters' speeches are converted into perfectly standard English. This already becomes apparent in the first few sentences of the play. The Dutch version is packed with exclamations and has an extremely colloquial nature:

Clementine: […] Nou dan! Cobus — Cobùs!

Cobus: […] Hè-hè-hè! Ikke heb niet geslapè …. Nee, neè….

This passage is representative of much of the text, since it illustrates Heijermans' frequent use of exclamations, as in *Nou dan!* and *Hè-hè-hè*, and informal language, such as *Ikke* and *geslapè*. Moreover, this small excerpt clearly depicts Heijermans' preference for accentuation to denote which syllables are stressed in everyday language.

In the St. John translation the passage looks decidedly different. It does not contain any exclamations or incorrect language, nor does St. John make use of accents, which, right from the beginning, conveys an atmosphere different from that of the original. The passage looks as follows:

CLEM. Cobus!

COBUS […] I wasn't asleep.

We observe that St. John has decided to retain the Dutch names in her translation. The conservation of the Dutch fisherman's environment is also reflected in the *dramatis personae*, in which it is stated that the action takes place in a fishing village on the coast of the North Sea at the present day. Moreover, this version retains the Dutch term *Mijnheer* (Mr.), which is awkward in the context of an English sentence. Although the tendency to preserve the original forms of address reflects the tradition of British and American writers to mark a specific text as foreign, to an English-speaking audience the foreign names will sound odd, and the Dutch forms of address will sound unnatural. Moreover, we should note that Heijermans uses the term *meneer*, which is the more informal version of the same word. St. John switches to the more formal and proper, which does not correspond to the setting of the play.

Throughout the translation Christopher St. John ignores the colloquial nature of Heijermans' dialogue and transfers it into a formal, proper, and generic language. We do not know how much direct translation from the Dutch Christopher St. John did herself, nor do we know whether she was capable of recognizing the use of non-standard regional and lower class dialogue in a language that was not her own. It is clear, however, that, in her translation, St. John disregards Heijermans' usage of working class regional speech. Although the reason for the neglect to capture the true essence of the dialogue is subject to speculation, St. John's course of action may have been motivated by the unavailability of a more or less comparable counterpart in a British context, which could easily be understood by speakers of the standard language. However, the most likely reason for St. John's disregard for dialectal language is that the TL audience might not be willing to accept it. Although such well-known authors as Chaucer, Shakespeare, Dickens and George Eliot made use of dialect in their drama and fiction in years preceding this translation, and there was a strong movement toward drama written in the Irish dialect with such playwrights as Sean O'Casey and William Butler Yeats, in the United Kingdom, at the turn of the century, structural clarity, decorum and the conventions of the *pièce-bien-faite* were still widely regarded as a high realization of dramatic art. As we have seen, in 1903, the date of the first performance of this translation, the new naturalist theatre was not yet fully appreciated in Great Britain. British critics preferred more traditional works, which did not give such an explicit and detailed description of the darker side of human existence. Moreover, the subject of the so-called "coffinships" had more or less lost its actuality in the United Kingdom, since similar conditions in the British fishing industry had been repaired as early as 1876.

Although St. John is apparently not concerned with the representation of regional and social dialect in the new text, she does try to convey a certain degree of informality by using contracted verb forms such as *wasn't* (7) *wouldn't* (9), *can't* (7), *you're* (8), *I've* (9), etc., and, sporadically, *ain't* (8). In addition, there are some colloquial expressions in this version, for example, *Tha's all ri'* (43), *He's half-seas over already* (41), *D'ye think he's hiding* (54), and *A great fellow of your age mustn't blubber like a child* (57). Furthermore, we find such grammatically incorrect constructions as *We wasn't allowed to read* (31), *It don't seem fair* (33), and *You'll never see me no more* (57). Apparently, this use of moderately informal language, combined with the, for British standards, unconventional subject matter was enough to shock the British audience, which was not used to the dramatic portrayal of the lives of lower class working people in all its facets. The critic in *The Stage* (Apr. 30, 1903) writes that "the dialogue [...] was aggressively offensive to the sensibility of the average English playgoer" (11). However, when Christopher St. John's translation of *Op hoop van zegen* was revived in London in 1912, the critical opinion was considerably more favourable. By this time the TL audience had become more familiar with the subject matter of the naturalist theatre, which no longer shocked the English middle and upper class sensibilities to the same extent as it did before. As a matter of fact, Heijermans is now praised for his theatrical technique because he does not engage in "sentimental paltering" with the truth (Palmer 577). This change in attitude toward Heijermans' work over a period of a decade is representative of a substantial shift, not only in the judgment of Heijermans as a playwright, but, more importantly, in the prevailing critical opinion in the United Kingdom, which shifted from a largely hostile perspective on the naturalist theatre around the turn of the century to a stance of recognition and approval several years later.

The language used in the St. John translation has a definite British flavour to it, with phrases such as *Shan't I just hear about this* (47) and *Tell us a yarn, do* (71), which proved to be a definite handicap when the translation was performed in New York in 1907. The reviewer for *Theatre Magazine* said of the production when it was performed in New York:

> ... it would not be easy to conceive of a more inadequate performance of it than was given by these English, always English, actors ... The finest of Sevres had as well try to 'act' the commonest delftware as Ellen Terry an ignorant, sordid widow of a Dutch fisherman (qtd. by Knetsch 115).

However, the play is praised for its "color and characterization" in *The New York Times* (Feb. 17, 1907). While no explicit comments on the use of language are made in this review, it is implied that the critic sees merit in St. John's moderate use of colloquial language, even if it is not a representation of a regional and/or social dialect. In the American literary tradition of the time there existed a rather strong tendency to support works written in non-standard language. All through the last two decades of the nineteenth century there had been an urging of American writers to create their own literary tradition by depicting actual American life through the use of regional and/or social dialects in fiction and drama. Writers like Mark Twain, Joel Chandler Harris, James Russell Lowell and Henry Ward Beecher employed dialect in fiction, while Bret Harte, Thomas Bailey Aldrich and William Dean Howells put dialect plays upon the American stage. In June 1895, William Dean Howells dedicated three articles in *Harper's Weekly* to the virtues of dialect in literature, which he defended as "part of the world-wide movement [...] towards greater naturalness and lifelikeness" (qtd. by Nettels 66). Although there existed a strong opposition against dialect literature, the most distinguished critic of it being Henry James, it was widely used by Howells' contemporaries, making the American public familiar with the phenomenon of *couleur locale* in poetry, fiction and drama.

In her translation, however, Englishwoman Christopher St. John is not concerned with the depiction of regional or social dialect. Although in this English version we have a vague idea that we are not dealing with upper or even middle class people, we have no indication as far as the geographical setting of the conversation is concerned. In general, the regional and lower class character of the original dialogue has been diluted and standardized into generic British English, which has important consequences for the atmosphere of the play as a whole. Not only do we lose the dimensions of regional setting and social status in this translation, what is more, with the deletion of these dimensions, this text is reduced to a composition without depth or profundity.

In this translation we find many instances of careless translation work, and there are frequent changes in the script in the form of deletions and abbreviations of dialogue. The play in the St. John version is considerably shorter than in the original, mainly because some of the scenes that give depth to such characters as Bos, his wife, and his secretary, named Kaps, are left out. In other cases, however, St. John expands on the original dialogue, thereby reducing the suspense of the play, as, for example, in Clementine's line

Why this very morning Simon the shipwright told you — (17). In the original version Heijermans uses Bos to cut off the line, so that it reads: *En vanmorgen nog* — (And just this morning —), creating a great deal more tension. As was mentioned already, the dialogue used in the St. John translation is formal and proper, which is also reflected in the levelling out of cursing and vulgarities in the text. Cobus' reference to peeing in his pants (*Ik doe niet in me broek as 'k vare mot*) becomes *I don't shiver in my shoes at the thought of going to sea* (11). Similarly, the Dutch words for whore, poor bastard, and damn are translated into the more acceptable phrases of *common drab* (30), *poor fellow* (31), and *Good Lord* (62), which may have been due to public pressure. Nevertheless, St. John's decision not to capture the essence of the Dutch dialogue, her deletions, abbreviations and embellishments of the dialogue, the many changes in the script, the usage of grammatically correct constructions, the numerous misinterpretations and smoothing out of profanities and coarse terms all point to the fact that she is not so much concerned with the exact interpretation of Heijermans' play as with the contemporary British audience's expectations. These factors have seriously changed the nature of the play. As we have seen above, the use of language by the naturalists is closely connected with the depiction of *milieu*, both socially and regionally. In the translation by Christopher St. John the connection between these factors is completely lost. The characters' speech is a standard form of English, despite some attempts to make it seem less formal. There is no specific link between the speech of the characters and their regional and social environment, which is what Heijermans tried to establish. St. John fails to note the social environment of the characters, and, consequently, overlooks the importance of the poverty of the characters. For example, in mistranslating Daantje's speech, *Bone met speksaus* (Beans with bacon grease) as *beans and bacon* (63), she disregards the sarcasm with which the dialogue is spoken. Furthermore, the characters and conditions in the play are significantly affected by the additions, deletions and abbreviations of certain parts of dialogue. St. John leaves out much of the foreshadowing of the tragedy, she deletes symbols that point to the disaster that is imminent, and adds more explicit passages, such as Simon's speech: *She's a floating coffin. The man who* *sails in her will never see port again. She's rotten. Tha's all ri'....* (44), which is never explicitly mentioned in the original. St. John adds a passage that is a clear hint to the events that are about to take place. Although Heijermans drops hints as well, he does so in a much more subtle way, which constitutes an important part of the play's mood, and gives it its intensity. In addition, the atmosphere of the play is also altered due to translational errors made by St. John, which change the symbols used by Heijermans into mere padding, and delete the aspect of foreboding. For instance, St. John translates the line *Lekke schepe motte zinke* (Leaky ships must sink) as *Lucky ships always sink* (42), thereby reversing the intent of the line. In the same vein, *Ouwe schepe vergaan 't minst* (Old ships don't go down easily) is translated into *It don't take much to make an old ship go down* (64). The result of St. John's deletions and additions, in Knetsch's words, is "a loss of continuity, a weakening of character development, and an overemphasis on, and oversimplification of, the play's plot" (111). The richness of the play's language, depth of character and the complexity of its conflict have been severely altered in the St. John edition. Howver, Knetsch does not attempt to explain why these shifts in the translated text might have taken place.

The next translation of *Op hoop van zegen* to be discussed was made by Harriet Gampert Higgins and was published in 1912 in a theatre review entitled *The Drama* alongside an article on Heijermans written by Ashley Dukes. *The Drama* was a theatre magazine, which included theatre reviews, experimental, fringe and young people's theatre, and featured articles on theatre personalities in the United Kingdom and abroad. Unfortunately, Dukes' article does not offer a rationale for the new translation of *Op hoop van zegen* or even does so much as discuss it. As far as can be reasonably established, the translation by Gampert Higgins has not been performed, and was meant solely to be read. What strikes us as soon as we look at this translation is that, in comparison with that of Christopher St. John, it is much closer to the original text. Without exception, Gampert Higgins stays exceedingly close to the contents of the play, in that she does not eliminate or alter passages, and to its structure, even to such an extent that she follows Heijermans' sentence structure and, in more extreme cases, his word order. Although there are not as many translational errors or misinterpretations in this version as in the one discussed earlier, the word-for-word translations throughout the text result in some rather unusual language. The literalness, which is the distinguishing feature of the Gampert Higgins translation, is already illustrated in the first few lines:

> *Clementine. [...] Now, then! Cobus!*
> *Cobus. [...] He-he-he! I wasn't asleep — No, no —*

These lines are almost a precise reproduction of Heijermans original passage. The exclamations have been preserved in the translation. However, they are Dutch exclamations such as *Nou dan!* and *He-he-he*, and, later in the text, *Tja* (17), *Peh* (19), *Ach* (24), and *Hahaha* (24) have not been transposed into English. Although Gampert Higgins retains the Dutch exclamations, she does not follow Heijermans by using the same accentuation as he does. In fact, she deletes all indications of stressed syllables denoted by Heijermans.

In addition to the preservation of the Dutch interjections and exclamations throughout the text, Gampert Higgins frequently makes use of literal translations of idiomatic expressions, which has a considerable potential for confusing the English-speaking reader. For example, we find the phrase *Pluck feathers off a frog's back* (57), which is an exact translation of *Pluk vere van 'n kikker*. As Knetsch points out, a rendering closer to the meaning of the original would have been *You can't squeeze blood from a turnip* (117). We also find such phrases as *Do sit still — one would think you'd eaten horse flesh* (50) and *Here, you can't stand on one leg* (52) for *Zit toch stil! 't Lijkt wel of je paardevlees het gegete* and *Hier, op één been kan je niet staan*. The Dutch phrases are idiomatic expressions, the former referring to having "ants in your pants" (Knetsch 117) and the latter not alluding to physical stance, but offering a second helping. Similarly, Gampert Higgins translates the word *lazerus* in *Lazerus! Hé, Simon!* (47) literally, which in Dutch is slang for "dead drunk." The word does not convey this meaning in English. The phrases mentioned are just a few examples of the many occurring throughout the text, instances in which Gampert Higgins uses literal translations for the dialogue, and thereby fails, perhaps to note, but certainly to convey the connotative meaning of the dialogue. This leads to much confusion and misunderstanding, and gives the text an awkwardness which cannot easily be dismissed.

However, Gampert Higgins does make limited use of contracted forms of verbs, such as *wasn't* (17), *ain't* (18), *they'll* (19), and *'twas* (22) to emphasize the informal character of the dialogue. In addition, there are grammatically incorrect constructions such as *It don't look like him yet* (18), *It ain't allowed* (18), and *I says* (87). Furthermore, we find omissions of letters to stress the colloquial nature, as in *When y'r used to chewing* (18) and *Give it to 'im* (20). Nevertheless, the play does not convey an informal atmosphere, because the regional and social aspects of the original have been ignored in this translation, and much of the colloquial language has disappeared. The text has not been rendered in a more or less comparable English regional and/or social dialect. Just like Christopher St. John, who takes into account the expectations of the TL spectators, Gampert Higgins adapts the original text to the wishes of the members of her reading public, who, generally, do not want to invest time or effort into a text written in a language that they are not very familiar with and will therefore take them longer to read than a text in the standard language. Gampert Higgins, then, is aware of the expectations of her readers, who, by 1912, were somewhat familiar with the naturalist trend in the theatre, and moderately appreciative, but not yet willing to wholeheartedly accept the new ideas.

Although Gampert Higgins retains most of Heijermans dialogue without serious omissions, she may have been subject to public pressure because she edits out selected passages which might be offensive to the American sentiment. Coarse terms and profanities such as *matrozenhoer* (sailor's whore), *Jessus* (Jesus), and *Stront voor dank* (Shit for thanks) have been ironed out, and changed into *any sailor's girl* (38), *Good gracious* (42), and *Dirt is all the thanks you get* (53). Although these substitutions make the play less offensive in this translation, much of the humour of these expressions, and, more importantly, the intensity and emotion of the play's dialogue, are lost in the process. What is more, the substitutions eliminate much of the colloquial style of Heijermans' dialogue, which determines so much of the personalities of the characters, and reflects their social status. Combined with the literalness of this translation, the deletion of selected parts of the colloquial conversations makes for some extremely unusual dialogue. The characters now speak a formal, archaic and awkward language characterized by a sentence structure paralleling the Dutch, which can be illustrated in the following examples. Jo says: *I'll wager if you pet the hens he will come down of himself from jealousy* (24) (*Wedde dat as je met de kippies vrijt dat de haan jaloers wordt en vanzelf na benee tippelt?*). Another striking illustration of the literal translation of Dutch language usage, word order, and sentence structure in the Gampert Higgins translation is exemplified by this line spoken by Bos: *You ought to have a face as red as a buoy in shame for the way you flapped out your nonsense* (93) (*Je most 'n kop as 'n boei krijge, om de ondoordachtheid, waarmee je 'r nonsens uitflapt*). This passage is almost a direct reflection of the Dutch sentence, even to such an extent that it uses the Dutch idiomatic expression of *Een gezicht als een boei hebben* (to have a face as red as a beetroot), here literally translated as *to have a face as red as a buoy*.

Similar to St. John, Gampert Higgins retains selected Dutch terms in her translation. She uses both *mijnheer* and *meneer*, and inconsistently uses the term *mevrouw* (Mrs.). Although, as we have already established, it tends to be the practice of British and American translators to preserve some indications of exoticism, the use of any Dutch titles can lead to confusion and misunderstanding for the reader, and the problem is only increased by the translator's inconsistency. Overall, it seems that Harriet Gampert Higgins had little understanding of the Dutch language and its idioms. As Knetsch puts it, "her literal translations obscure the intent of the dialogue, and in the process Heijermans' play is lost" (122).

The third translation of *Op hoop van zegen* was produced by Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink. It was completed in the United States in 1925, performed in New York in October of 1927, and published in 1928. Saunders translated several of Heijermans' plays and was very much interested in gaining the exclusive rights to the translation, production and publication of his works. However, Heijermans only granted her special translation and representation privileges for the United States and Canada (Knetsch 123). Although it is stated in the published edition of the translation that this is the "only authorized translation" of *Op hoop van zegen*, this information is incorrect. Heijermans did grant translation privileges to Saunders in 1924, but he died before the translation was completed. Both Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink were instrumental in the promotion of Herman Heijermans in the United States, since they managed to publish a number of his plays in translation, and, more importantly, brought plays like *Eva Bonheur* and *The Good Hope* to the attention of Eva LeGallienne, thereby securing their productions.

The foreword to this translation, which is written by J. Brooks Atkinson, is mainly concerned with Heijermans' dramatic technique and the plot of the play. In it no mention is made of the translation itself. When we look at the text, we find that, just as in the translations previously discussed, the translators stay fairly close to the original. This can, for example, be clearly illustrated by the interjections and exclamations, which are retained in their original Dutch forms. The first lines of this translation look as follows:

> *Clementine [...] Now! Now! ... Cobus!*
> *Cobus [...] Héhéhé! I wasn't asleep ... no ... no.*

These lines are representative of the rest of the text in that they show the use of Dutch phrases and expressions. Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink even retain some of Heijermans' accentuation, as is demonstrated in the phrase *Héhéhé*. However, Heijermans employs the exclamation *Hè-hè-hè*, in which he makes use of an *accent grave*, which, firstly, indicates a different pronunciation, and, secondly, gives the phrase a different meaning. In the following there are such Dutch exclamations and interjections as *Tja* (1), *Peh* (3), *Pst* (5), and *Hahaha* (52). The Dutch forms are also retained with regard to proper names and titles. Not only *meneer* (mister) and *mevrouw* (Mrs.) are used, but the range is much more extensive, including *juffrouw* (miss), *tante* (aunt), *tantetje* (auntie), *gulden* (guilder) and *sallusies* (greetings). In some cases, the translators are rather inconsistent as far as the use of Dutch and English phrases is concerned. For example, we find both a translated phrase and a preserved Dutch term in sentences such as *Or a burgemeester, or a policeman* (23), and *Coffee, mother?... tante, I mean* (92). Although, as was already mentioned, it seems to be customary in British and American writing and in the media of these countries to use such terms as "markers of foreignness," they create confusion and awkwardness in the performance of the translation, because the terms are likely not understood by the audience. Moreover, it now appears to the audience that the characters speak two languages.

Although there are less translational errors and misinterpretations in this translation than in the two previously discussed, likely because of the cooperation of native speakers of English and Dutch, as Knetsch points out, we do find evidence of carelessness on the part of the translators. In this edition Barend has been unemployed for eight months (17) instead of nine, and his age is changed from nineteen to eighteen (130). Similar to Gampert Higgins, Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink frequently resort to literal translations, which produce an awkwardness that is damaging to the nature of the play. Translational errors are apparent when *Schiet op* (Hurry up) is translated as *Shut up* (34), *rakkers* (cops) becomes *brutes* (82), and *'k Stik 'r al in* (I'm about to choke on it as it is) is changed into *It sticks in my throat* (98). The character of the play is undermined in particular when the translational errors and misinterpretations involve Dutch expressions and idioms. For example, Jo's speech *Nee, die is goed* is translated into *Well, that's good* (39) instead of *Oh, come on*, which would more closely reflect its meaning. In a like manner, Cobus says: *Other places he just stands with his mouth full of teeth* (7). The Dutch *en anders staat-ie met z'n bek vol tande* refers to Barend being tongue-tied, which does not become clear in this translation. The tendency to translate literally results in grammatical problems in the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink translation. By trying to stay as closely to the Dutch original as possible, the syntax of much of the dialogue has become inappropriate to English, resulting in poor language usage. This is clearly illustrated in the following sentence spoken by Saart: *You've got* *to put three times in the paper a notice that your husband is missing and then if three times you don't get any sign of life from him you can get a new licence* (100), which is a translation of *Dan mot je, geloof 'k, eerst in de krante oproepe, waar die zit — en as je driemaal geen asem gekrege het, dan mag-ie 'n nieuw boterbriefie hale.* This translation almost exactly follows the sentence structure of the original, creating a rather awkward English sentence.

In addition to the literal translation of parts of the text, much of the colloquial nature of Heijermans' dialogue has been disregarded. Coarse and profane references in the play are deleted in favour of less crude expressions. For instance, Cobus' mention of peeing in his pants (*ik doe niet in me broek*) becomes *I don't get a pain in my belly* (7), *doodvreter* (parasite) is changed to *lazy brat* (11), and for *hoer* (whore) *huzzy* (44) is used. However, the translators freely retain the many damns and goddamns that occur in the original. Furthermore, some dialogue which is vital to the play's climactic build-up is left out. This mostly involves passages that foreshadow the tragic events. The stories told by the women in the third act are shortened considerably, and such symbolically important lines as Bos' reference to casting pearls to the swine (75) and his ripping up of Clementine's sketches of Barend from her drawing pad (140) are eliminated. By deleting these passages, damage is done to the overall structure of the play and Heijermans' dramatic technique.

The translation by Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink was generally well-received when it was performed in New York by the Civic Repertory Theatre in 1927. Judging from the photographs that are reprinted in the bound edition of the translation, much effort has been made to preserve the Dutch fisherman's environment. The rooms are made to look exceedingly plain and the actors are wearing, what can be taken to be, Dutch fishermen's costumes. Although the translators do make an attempt to depict colloquial and informal language, which is reflected in the many exclamations, contracted forms of verbs such as *didn't* (13), incorrect usages such as *ain't* (2), and slang like *grub* (3) and *snoot* (40), the language used has largely been adjusted to the new environment, the American theatre, and in particular the New York stage. By the late 1920s the

American audience was accustomed to naturalist plays, which made the reception of *The Good Hope* considerably more favourable than that of the earlier performance in 1907. By this time the American audience had become used to the concept of "truth to life" in art and the realistic treatment of familiar life, which was practised by such playwrights as Edward Harrigan, James A. Herne and Clyde Fitch. However, Knetsch notes that a Dutch correspondent who attended the 1927 performance of the Civic Repertory Theatre found "the entire production to be very unnatural, while another felt that Kniertje was too aristocratic and in no way like an earthy fisherman's wife" (130-31). This sentiment on the part of Dutch critics, I would speculate, is not so much linked to the representation of the Dutch fishermen's environment, as to the loss of the depiction regionally and socially determined language in this particular translation. As we have seen, the mood of the original is very closely connected to the environment in which it is set. The setting determines the subject matter, the social and moral standards of the characters, and their manner of speaking. It would be unimaginable for a Dutch audience, familiar with the original, to see the play performed set in the original surroundings, but spoken in standard language. It was the naturalist's goal to portray ordinary people in their genuine circumstances. Similarly, Heijermans intended to depict the Dutch fisherman in his natural environment, which encompasses authentic costumes and scenery, but, most importantly of all, the fisherman's earthy and unaffected language.

Piet Reinier Knetsch translated *Op hoop van zegen* into English in 1984 as part of his dissertation completed at the University of Kansas. Unlike the three previous translators he does not call his translation *The Good Hope*, but instead entitles it *In Hope of Providence*, which, as he explains in his methodology, "improves upon *The Good Hope* in more clearly reflecting Heijermans' intent" by expressing religious associations (143). Knetsch claims that, although the title of the previous translations is theatrically vivid, it "fails to convey that which is being "hoped" for, which is blessing, or divine guidance and protection" (143). The new title, however, does express this aspect, and is, in this way, a more accurate interpretation of the Dutch.

In his methodology Knetsch defines his rationale for the "new translation for performance," which is based on the "inadequacy" of the previous editions (141). It is his goal to represent the simplicity and theatricality of *Op hoop van zegen* by developing a performance-oriented, complete and faithful translation of the play, which aims to capture the colloquial nature of the dialogue. Knetsch divides his working method into two steps. The first stage involves faithful adherence to the original without adapting or altering Heijermans' work. This entails the development of dramatically effective dialogue by using appropriate English counterparts of Dutch idioms. Knetsch proposes to cite problematic translations and unfamiliar names by footnotes. The second step in Knetsch's methodology consists of verification of the interpretation. This has been accomplished by the screening of a video recording of a performance of the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink translation and the assistance of native speakers of Dutch. Furthermore, Knetsch explains that he has added stage directions in those cases in which a particular attitude, action or emotion would be difficult to translate within the dialogue itself. It is Knetsch's main objective in this translation to convey Heijermans' *intent*, which, in his opinion, can best be depicted through the "faithful" adherence to and interpretation of the colloquial and informal character of Heijermans' dialogue. It is interesting to note here that in Knetsch's methodology no mention is made of the regional aspects of the characters' environment, and, in particular, the specific regional quality and colour of the characters' speech, which is apparent in the dialogue used by Heijermans throughout the play. Although for a native speaker the regional features of the text cannot easily be missed, Knetsch, the son of Dutch immigrants to the United States, does not recognize these features as such, but, instead, classifies them as colloquial speech.

Knetsch's translation differs from those previously discussed because of its explicit use of North American English. As soon as we look at this translation we discover that it has an extremely colloquial nature, which has been designed to represent North American informal, spoken language as closely as possible. Similar to Heijermans' text, we find many unfinished sentences, grammatically incorrect constructions, idioms, contemporary colloquial expressions and words spelled as they are pronounced. Knetsch leaves sentences unfinished in the same places as Heijermans does, such as for example in Barend's speech *Who are ... Geert* (172), and Geert's speeches *'Cause I ...* (173) and *Is Arie ...* (184). In addition, we find colloquial phrases like *Oh, heck! We ain't got nothin' t' say about nothin'* (151), *Ya shoulda heard 'r cussin'* (159), *Whadda ya mean* (174) and *Ya don't "gotta" nothin'* (185). Moreover, there are idioms such as *Ya can't squeeze blood from a turnip* (207), *I ain't gonna get soused* (176), and informal expressions like *I look like shit* (172), *Were they pissed off at me?* (173) and *Ya can kiss my ass!* (204). Knetsch has not made an attempt to make the text less offensive, which might well have something to do with the time at which the translation was produced. In 1984 the American public could hardly be shocked any more by profanities and bad language. The modern audience's sensibilities have been numbed in as far as people are exposed to vulgarities and obscenities in their daily lives, in their own environment, on television, and in movies and plays. Therefore, Knetsch does not hesitate to retain the swearwords and profanities occurring in the original, and, in those cases in which specific utterances are impossible to translate, to use equally strong counterparts. Knetsch frequently compensates for what cannot immediately be translated into English by expressing the colloquial nature of the dialogue in a different manner than that used in the original. This translational technique of compensation is illustrated in the opening lines of the play:

> *CLEMENTINE Come on! Cobus!*
> *COBUS I wasn't sleepin', no sirree ...*

Instead of trying to find matching English exclamations for the ones that occur in the original, Knetsch here uses the common colloquial English interjection of *sirree*, which more clearly depicts Cobus' speech and character, and does not make the text sound unnatural or awkward to the American TL audience.

In his "translation for performance" Knetsch is naturally very much concerned with the performance dimension of the new text, while attempting to be "faithful" to

Heijermans' original at the same time. These two goals are brought together by his aim to recreate Heijermans' intent through the use of dramatically effective and colloquial dialogue. Knetsch has added brief stage directions in instances in which a particular attitude, custom or emotion was difficult to translate within the dialogue. This TL audience-oriented approach is illustrated in the following examples: the Dutch representation of laughter *hèhèhè* is converted into *[chuckles]* (153, 155) or *[laughs]* (155, 191), the Dutch custom of congratulating everyone in the room on the occasion of a birthday is added in the stage direction *[She starts to greet and congratulate everyone]* (190), and clarifications of a certain tone of voice used in a particular situation are given, for example in *[sarcastically]* (178), *[Joking]* (180), *[confidentially]* (186), and *[In good humor]* (191).

However, Knetsch has decided to stay closer to the original in other instances. As he points out in his methodology, he makes use of footnotes in the translation to clear up difficult renderings and explain unfamiliar names. Although some footnotes are used to justify minor changes in the text as a result of untranslatable passages or phrases, the majority of footnotes deal with the explanation of terms which would be foreign to an American audience but are retained in the translation. For example, there is a footnote concerning Clementine's use of *Bonjour*, which would clearly indicate to a Dutch audience that Clementine is one of the more educated characters in the play (163). Such an implication, however, is necessarily lost on an American audience, which does not start out with the same cultural background and expectations as the original Dutch spectators. Although, in the footnote, Knetsch explains that this use of language sets Clementine apart from the other characters, the spectator cannot be made aware of this aspect during the performance, unless it is somehow incorporated into the spoken text or explained in the program notes. In the same vein, Knetsch retains the names of Dutch towns, and cites them by footnotes. Examples of this practice are *Maassluis* (170), *Atjeh*, which is changed into *Sumatra* (182), *Vlaardingen* (228), *IJmuiden* (241) and *Den Helder* (256). Similarly, specifically Dutch customs, such as the shaking of hands and congratulating of everyone present on the occasion of a birthday, the special purchases for birthday celebrations, and the reference to Domela Nieuwenhuis, a nineteenth century Dutch socialist leader and activist (195), are mentioned in footnotes. While these references make the text more understandable to the TL *reader*, they do nothing of the sort for the TL *spectator*, unless they are included in the program notes. Even if this is the case, the text will still have a certain foreign feel to it, which might well make it awkward and not easily comprehensible.

Although Knetsch's translation does have a very informal character, much more so than the three previous translations, we have already established that he seems to overlook the regional aspect of the language employed by Heijermans. However admirable the translation may be in transferring the colloquial content from Dutch into English, an essential component of the original is missing because of its lack of a specific regional character. The elements of language that a Dutch audience would immediately recognize as being part of the western Dutch tradition, fall away as the language is weakened and translated into generic North American colloquial and informal speech. Looking at the Knetsch translation, we undoubtedly realize that the *milieu* that is depicted is lower class and that the people who are portrayed are poorly educated. We have no clue, however, to the specificity of the geographical setting of the play or the characters' *métier*. Therefore, the audience must rely on the normal procedure of accepting the program notes to supply the regional environment and the social circumstances of the characters.

Chapter 6: COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Now that we have obtained a broad overview of the nature of the four English translations, we can return to the polysystemic theoretical framework discussed in the previous chapters according to which our findings can be analyzed and evaluated. As we have established above, Herman Heijermans played a considerable role in the movement in the Dutch theatre at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries toward a more contemporary form of drama in which actual reality was depicted on the stage. This naturalist trend in the Netherlands was instigated from abroad by such playwrights as Zola, Ibsen, Hauptmann and Chekhov, and swept over Europe with such force that many a literary system could not escape its influence. Naturalist writers regarded their characters as products of their environments, who are crushed by social and economic circumstances. Therefore, they frequently portrayed simple characters who live in the most oppressive environments.

In the Netherlands naturalist theatre was rapidly being acknowledged as the dominant form of innovative, avant-garde theatre, and, later, canonized in the nation's literary and theatre history. In England, on the other hand, it was much more contested and never really canonized. In the United States, it was accepted as innovative, but later than in continental Europe, and even later canonized, albeit in its much less "pure" forms.

Heijermans, who made use of the naturalist approach toward literature to bring forward the cause of the worker, applied the naturalist method of accurate and detailed reproduction to the Dutch situation, and found his own manner of describing the life and people of the Netherlands. *Op hoop van zegen* shows distinctly naturalist features, such as the depiction of the impoverished fisherman's environment, in which rebellion against unethical and inequitable conditions is fruitless, but, what is equally important, it specifically describes the Dutch situation. In the play we find references to Dutch names and places, and typically Dutch customs are described in detail. *Op hoop van zegen*, therefore, is a representative example of the new paradigm introduced from abroad into the Dutch theatre of the turn of the century, and which inspired native dramatists such as Heijermans. It is the realization of the naturalist ideals adjusted to the Dutch locality.

In terms of the polysystem theory, then, we may claim that, through our analysis of the relations within the semiotic system that is the literary tradition, it has been established that the norms of the Dutch authors, texts, institutions, and readers at the turn of the century followed the powerful trend on the rest of the European continent, because the inclination towards naturalism in all forms of literary expression began to dictate the new norms and models of the Dutch theatre of the time. Using the functional approach of the polysystem, we will discuss the historically determined literary conventions, interpretations, and practices which were prevalent at the different times and places of reception of the four translations. These findings, which can be assigned a relative, historical value, will assist us in determining the socio-literary status of a translation, which is dependent on its position in the polysystem. In other words, for the descriptive study of translation, it is essential to examine peripheral circumstances, in order to be able to adequately describe the relationship between original and translations and analyze and evaluate the functions and positions of the translated texts in the different TL systems.

In this study it has been determined that the translator of theatre texts is required to deal with a wide variety of considerations that are inherent in the complex nature of the theatre text and the dialectical relation with its performance. In addition to cultural, historical, ideological and socio-political factors, traits specific to the source and target theatres need to be taken into account, as well as reason and emotion expressed in the text and on the stage, and the verbal and non-verbal elements that are clearly verbalized or implicitly suggested in the text.

We have already established that there are different strategies by which to approach the description of translations of theatre texts, which are outlined by Susan Bassnett. Bassnett's first strategy, which looks upon the dramatic text as if it were a purely literary work, is illustrated in the Harriet Gampert Higgins translation. Gampert Higgins' translation appeared in a periodical of dramatic literature, and apparently was not meant to be performed. Therefore, Gampert Higgins does not need to concern herself with the "performability" of the translation, which makes translation for the stage such a complex undertaking. From a theoretical point of view, fewer difficulties should arise in this type of translation, for the translator does not need to take into account the relationship between the text and its performance. This gives the translator the opportunity to fully concentrate on the textual and formal aspects of the play. Higgins tries to stay as close to the original as possible in an attempt to produce a truly "faithful" translation. However, as far as the authentic portrayal of dialogue is concerned, she does not succeed in making the conversations sound natural to the TL readers, nor do they do justice to a Dutch fishermen's environment. Higgins deletes the colloquial and regional nature of the speech, which might well have been prompted by historically motivated circumstances. Although in 1912 the American reading audience would have been somewhat familiar with the depiction of regional and social dialect through the works of Mark Twain and others, the naturalist portrayal of lower class environments in all their facets had not yet been accepted into the American literary system. Therefore, by making the text less offensive, Gampert Higgins adjusts it to the American TL system. However, she retains the original environment and does not alter most of the typically Dutch customs, phrases and expressions. Although it would assist the reader of this translation to find unclear terms, expressions or sentence structures, of which there are many in this version, explained in footnotes, Gampert Higgins does not supply any, thereby making the reading of this translation by target culture readers quite laborious.

All four translations retain the authentic Dutch fishermen's environment as the setting of the play. The action has not been transposed to a contemporary indigenous fishermen's *milieu*. In none of the translations have the Dutch names of persons and places been translated, which makes them appear distinctly foreign to the different TL audiences. According to Theo Hermans, we should be able to draw tentative conclusions about the general nature of the translated texts from this fact (1988, 14). In his view, the preservation of Dutch personal names and titles points to the translators' adherence to the structure and substance of the original, which appears to be an accurate deduction with regard to our case study. Contrary to Bassnett's description of strategies, however, in our case it is clear that the use of the original environment as a background is not meant to depict the humorousness of the situation of the Dutch fisherman, but to portray the urgency of his predicament, and to be true to the Dutch reality of the turn of the century.

Apparently, all four translators, although operating at different times, were of the opinion that the forcefulness of the play would be lost if the setting were transferred from a Dutch fishing village to a British or American one. While the play, in these four translations, is transferred to be read by or performed before a new audience in a new system, and in some cases at a new time, as in the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink and Knetsch versions, the original deictic elements, which refer to the Dutch reality of the turn of the century, are retained, consequently influencing the degree of performability of the translations. Moreover, already in 1903 the play would have lost much of its intensity in Great Britain, since the Merchant Shipping Act, in which comparable conditions in the British fisheries had been outlawed, was introduced as early as 1876.

However, the conservation of the Dutch fishermen's environment avoids many difficulties which might arise for the translator in trying to transfer the action from its original setting to a more contemporary local environment. Although Franz Link expresses the view that, to realize a playwright's intention, a play in dialect *should* be translated into a corresponding idiom, in which local references are changed accordingly (29), transposition of the action, in most instances, involves extensive adaptation. In our case, first of all, a credible British or American equivalent would have to be found for the Dutch fishermen's environment in which the same problems would exist, but, more importantly, in this environment the representation of a regional and social dialect would have to be developed which would somehow be equivalent to Heijermans' depiction of the western Dutch manner of speaking, a dialect, therefore, not far removed from the standard language, purporting to identify social class and geographical setting at the same time. In addition, references to typically Dutch customs or habits would have to be changed by adapting them to the conventions of the TL system. Knetsch is the only translator who more or less tries to deal directly with the Dutch cultural environment. While he chooses not to adjust the Dutch culturally determined elements to the American TL system, he does recognize the potential difficulties for performance which may be created by the original's specifically Dutch aspects, and attempts to solve these problems by making use of footnotes and additional stage directions, which serve to justify problematic translations or to explain those aspects that would not be immediately recognizable to an American audience.

Of the four translators, Knetsch is the one who is most concerned with the performance dimension of the translation. This instantly becomes clear from his subtitle, *A New Translation for Performance of "The Good Hope."* Knetsch attempts to construct a "performable" text by making use of dramatically effective dialogue. He translates Heijermans' colloquial dialogue into generic colloquial American English. Although he does seem to capture an appropriate counterpart of the social and political implications of the nature of the conversations in the original, he does not take into account the geographical and professional colouring underlying the dialogue. Although his reasons for ignoring the regional aspects of the dialogue are subject to speculation, Knetsch could have been unaware of this particular dimension, because the native speakers he consulted — his parents — might not have alerted him to this aspect. As mentioned in Knetsch's methodology (144), both were born and raised in Lisse in the province of North Holland, in which more or less the same regional dialect is spoken as the one employed by Heijermans. Therefore, Knetsch's parents might simply not have identified the dialogue as regional speech, but merely as a colloquial version of the standard language.

In an attempt to stay as close to the original as possible, Knetsch preserves passages that are closely bound to the cultural and linguistic context of the SL system. This makes the translation less performable in the TL culture, for the audience is faced with foreign elements which can easily be misunderstood or missed altogether. In a so-called "performable" translation these culturally specific elements are adjusted or eliminated entirely. Thus, while Knetsch purports the view that his own translation "improves" upon the three previous ones by virtue of its performability, we find that it is still rather closely tied to the original Dutch context of 1900, which might well be difficult to accept for an American audience some eighty years later.

We have already established that, in her translation, Harriet Gampert Higgins does not need to take into account aspects of performability, because performance of the text was not intended. This is clearly illustrated in the frequent occurrence of awkward expressions and sentence structures which would not have been acceptable in the theatre. Although Christopher St. John's translation and that of Lilian Saunders and Caroline

Heijermans-Houwink *were* both produced to be performed, it may be stated that these translators are rather inconsistent as far as the translation of performability is concerned. Similarly to Gampert Higgins, St. John and Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink choose not to represent Heijermans' colloquial dialogue. St. John's decision not to do so might well have something to do with the performability of the text, and was likely motivated by historically determined factors. The intellectual environment in the British theatre around the turn of the century was not conducive to the new European theatre. While Heijermans' original was appropriate to the Dutch theatrical tradition of the time, in its unaltered form it certainly would not have been acceptable in the British literary system, which still very much adhered to the old traditions.

It seems unlikely that for Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink, who aimed at the American public with their 1925 translation, the same would have held true. As we have already established, there was a discernible trend towards the use of dialect in literature in the United States around the end of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth centuries, which is illustrated in the theatre by such plays as *Anna Christie* (1921), *Diff'rent* (1922), *Desire under the Elms* (1924) and *The Hairy Ape* (1925), all by Eugene O'Neill, which sported the use of colloquial language, and Edward Brewster Sheldon's *Romance* (1913), in which we find passages of American-Italian dialect, and O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones* (1920), in which Negro dialect is used. Therefore, the American audience was fairly familiar with the use of both colloquial language and regional and social dialects in the theatre. In fact, the use of dialect in the theatre had become so widespread by the end of the 1940s that in 1947 Lewis and Marguerite Herman published a *Manual of American Dialects for Radio, Stage, Screen and Television*, in which playwrights, directors and actors were instructed in the use and representation of dialect. However, Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink do not follow the prevalent trend in the American theatre by translating the regionally and socially determined dialogue of *Op hoop van zegen* into a more or less comparable American dialect. Similar to the St. John translation, Heijermans' extremely colloquial dialogue in this version has all but disappeared, and the regional and social dialect has been eliminated altogether. Although the translators do try to retain some of the play's colloquial nature, it is only used to such an extent that it is easily acceptable to the TL audience. In order not to alienate their New York audience by using some "exotic" dialect, and thereby putting themselves out of the market, Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink took the safe route of transferring Heijermans' dialogue into standard North American English with a slightly colloquial flavour, which would be comprehensible to speakers all over the United States, thereby producing a more "performable" translation.

Both the St. John and the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink translations take a particular approach toward the translation of performability when it comes to the treatment of typically Dutch customs and habits. St. John and Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink do not seem to recognize Heijermans' descriptions of characteristically Dutch customs, for they do not make mention of any translational difficulties concerning culturally determined passages, or provide footnotes in which these passages are explained. These particular passages can create a significant obstacle in the performances of the two translations, because they will essentially be lost on an uninformed British or American audience. Without justification or explanation in the program notes, persons in the audience must necessarily resign themselves to the fact that these passages are part of a cultural context unfamiliar to them and that they cannot be expected to understand them.

It seems that the concept of performability has also exerted some degree of influence on the final versions of the different translations in terms of their respective lengths. Both the St. John and the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink translations are considerably shorter than the original, which is mainly due to the deletion, abbreviation and elimination of portions of dialogue, apparently only for the sake of brevity. In addition, passages that were deemed to be too offensive to the tastes of the target audiences have been deleted in these two versions.

Since Gampert Higgins did not need to concern herself with the particular constraints of translating for the theatre, and because of her overall commitment to literalness, her translation, except for the rendering of coarse expressions, generally follows Heijermans' original very closely, sometimes perhaps too closely, as we have established. Similarly, Knetsch also stays close to the original, both in use of language and length of the text. In his methodology we find that he is committed to a "complete and faithful" translation of *Op hoop van zegen*, which does not "adapt of alter Heijermans' work" (143-144). However, unlike Gampert Higgins, in his translation, Knetsch gives emphasis to the development of dramatically effective dialogue, which is intended to make the new text acceptable to the TL audience.

What has become clear from our discussion of the concept of "performability" in the translation of theatre texts, is that the role of the audience in this is substantial. A play is produced by its original author to suit the particular needs and expectations of his/her native audience, and the performability of the text is dependent on the interaction between the actors and the audience. When this text is translated, it is transposed into a system in which the audience may have a radically different set of norms of what is accepted and/or expected in the theatre. Therefore, the translator must be aware of the theatrical conventions of both the SL and TL systems, so that he/she will be able to make the SL text, its action, actors and dialogue comprehensible, probable and accessible for the TL audience, which will increase its chances of success in the new system. As we have seen, the criteria for success in the TL system may differ from period to period and from culture to culture, depending on the extent to which the prevalent theatrical conventions of the SL and TL systems and the expectations of the respective audiences differ from or correspond with each other.

In order to be able to account for these culturally and temporally fluctuating factors, and enhance the degree of performability of the translated text, Bassnett advocates a cooperative approach toward the translation of theatre texts, whether this involves the collaboration of native speakers of the SL and TL, who presumably are familiar with their native systems due to their instinctive sense of deixis, or the input of the actors and/or the director by means of pre-performance readings. Of the four translations, only the one by Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink is an acknowledged cooperative project. According to Bassnett-McGuire's description of translational strategies, a cooperative translation may have an advantage over those produced by a single translator in terms of its results, because it is usually produced by native speakers of both languages, in our case English and Dutch respectively. Native speakers are assumed to be particularly aware of the theatre conventions of their native systems, local conventional styles of performance, and the expectations of their native audiences. The combined knowledge of native speakers of the languages and cultures in question should give them a deeper insight into differentiations in the theatrical conventions of both systems, varying styles of performance, and the expectations of the respective audiences. Only after recognition of the potential variations in the theatrical style of both the SL and the TL systems can these differences be resolved, resulting in a "performable" translation. In our case, Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink do not adjust Heijermans' specifically Dutch theatrical style and content, nor do they seem to recognize the possible problems posed by culturally determined passages. Perhaps these variations were incommunicable. After all, we do not know how good Saunders' Dutch was, nor do we know how well Heijermans-Houwink spoke English. Although we find relatively few translational errors in this version, many of the features of the original, such as Dutch expressions and exclamations, can clearly be recognized in the translation. Saunders and Heijermans-Houwink resort to a literalness which makes the English version rather awkward and unnatural in its language usage, which, as we have already seen, does not benefit the performance dimension of the text.

Although Christopher St. John does not openly acknowledge her cooperators, in her preface to *The Rising Sun* she does admit that she received assistance from people who knew Dutch better than she. Knetsch points out that a 1903 article credits J.T. Grein, the founder of the Independent Theatre in London, with having assisted St. John in translating *The Good Hope* (106). It is not known to which extent he helped St. John in her translation, but I would speculate that his share in the translation is fairly limited. Judging from the many translational errors and misinterpretations, it would seem to me that, as a native speaker of Dutch, Grein could not have been deeply involved in the final rendering of the text. Leaving aside the matter of regional and social dialect, a native speaker of Dutch, familiar with Heijermans' dramatic technique, could surely not have authorized a translation which shows evidence of a lack of insight on the part of the translator, both in the interpretation of the original and in the willingness of the target culture to receive the translation.

Similar to St. John, Knetsch was also rendered assistance in the production of his translation. Although he does not have a co-translator, in his methodology he acknowledges the use of a video recording of a performance of the Saunders-Heijermans-Houwink translation and that of an audio recording of *Op hoop van zegen*, which helped him "in locating problem areas and contributed to an understanding of the play's rhythm" (144). In addition, interpretations of expressions were verified by Reinier and Maria Knetsch, his parents and native speakers of Dutch. Moreover, the draft of the translation was evaluated by Jan van Asselt, a professor of foreign languages who was born in the Netherlands. All these steps have undoubtedly resulted in a translation that is easily accessible to the American TL audience. Heijermans' colloquial dialogue has been transposed into colloquial American speech, and, more importantly, specifically Dutch expressions have been adjusted to the new system. Nevertheless, although culturally determined customs and conventions have been supplied with footnotes, much of the significance of these habits will still escape the American audience, unless explanations are included in the program notes.

In conclusion, it may be stated that the four translators have all decided to adhere closely to Heijermans' original in terms of content, which finds its manifestations in different aspects when we compare the three earlier translations with that produced by Knetsch. Particularly the earliest translations by Christopher St. John and Harriet Gampert Higgins had to contend with rather hostile British and American target systems, which unquestionably largely determined the final rendering of these texts. The representation of regional and social dialect, which makes up an integral part of the original, has been deleted, and profanities and coarse expressions are eliminated. By 1925, when Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink produced their translation, the American literary system was considerably more favourable to the naturalist theatre from the European continent. However, the translators still rely heavily on the traditional concept of propriety by disregarding Heijermans's use of dialect and editing out vulgarities. Piet Reinier Knetsch, on the other hand, does not concern himself with the polishing of the text into a less offensive rendering. In 1984, the year in which he translated *Op hoop van zegen*, these issues were of minor importance to the American target audience. It is Knetsch's primary concern to represent Heijermans' dialogue as "faithfully" as possible by using a colloquial style of conversation marked by idioms and coarse phrases transposed into American English.

What all four translations have in common is the preservation of the Dutch cultural context, albeit somewhat modified in the Knetsch translation. Apparently, the translators did not want to complicate things by transposing the action into their native environments, which more often than not involves considerable adaptation of the original. The disappearance of all the allegedly regionally, and much of the socially determined aspects of the original dialogue is another feature common to the four translations. The dialogue used in the four texts has been reduced, at best, to colloquial speech without any deeper dimensions, which puts it on a completely different plane compared to the language employed by Heijermans. Although this course of action on the part of the translators may have been motivated by different reasons, such as historically, culturally, and critically determined factors, this does not deny the fact that the translated texts have lost some of the most important dimensions of the original. The forcefulness and intensity of the original, which give it such emotion and vigour, have vanished along with the humour and passion which are buried in its regionally and socially determined utterances.

Selected Bibliography

1. POLYSYSTEM STUDIES

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London & New York: Methuen, 1980a.

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan, and André Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History and Culture*. London & New York: Pinter, 1990.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute, 1978.

---. "Polysystem Studies." *Poetics Today* 2.1, 1990.

---. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 1.2 (1979): 287-310.

---. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Eds. J.S. Holmes, *et al.* Leuven: ACCO, 1978. 117-27.

---. "Translation Theory Today. A Call for Transfer Theory." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 1-7.

Gorp, Hendrik van, *et al.* "Polysysteem(theorie)." *Lexicon van literaire termen. Stromingen en genres, theoretische begrippen, retorische procédés en stijlfiguren*. 5th ed. Leuven: Wolters, 1991. 31.

Gorp, Hendrik van. "Traductions et évolution du genre littéraire. Le roman picaresque au 17ème et 18ème siècles." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 209-19.

Hermans, Theo, ed. *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literature and Translation*. New York: St. Martin P, 1985.

Hermans, Theo. "On Translating Proper Names, with Reference to *De Witte* and *Max Havelaar*." *Modern Dutch Studies. Essays in Honour of Peter King*. Eds. Michael Wintle and Paul Vincent. London: The Athlone P, 1988. 11-24.

Holmes, J.S., *et al.*, eds. *Literature and Translation. New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven: ACCO, 1978.

Holmes, J.S., ed. *The Nature of Translation*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Holmes, J.S. "The State of Two Arts: Literary Translation and Translation Studies in the West Today." *International Federation of Translators. Xth World Congress of FIT.*

Ed. Hildergund Bühler. Vienna: Braumüller, 1985. 147-53.

Holmes, J.S., ed. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.

Lambert, José. "Théorie de la littérature et théorie de la traduction en France (1800-1850) interpretées à partir de la théorie du polysystème." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 161-70.

---. "L'Éternelle question des frontières: littératures nationales et systèmes littéraires." *Langue, Dialecte, Littérature*. Eds. C. Angelet, *et al*. Leuven: Leuven UP, 1983.

Lefevere, André. "Beyond the Process: Literary Translation in Literature and Literary Theory." *Translation Spectrum. Essays in Theory and Practice*. Ed. Marilyn Gaddis Rose. Albany: State U of New York P, 1981. 52-59.

---. "Literary Theory and Translated Literature." *Dispositio* VII. 19-20-21 (1982): 3-22.

---. "Programmatic Second Thoughts on 'Literary' and 'Translation' or: Where Do We Go From Here." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 39-50.

---. "Teaching Literary Translation: The Possible and the Impossible." *Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting*. Eds. W. Wilss and G. Thome. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984. 90-97.

---. "Translating Literature/Translated Literature — The State of the Art." *The Languages of Theatre*. Ed. Ortrun Zuber. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1980. 153-61.

---. "Translation and Comparative Literature: The Search for the Centre." *TTR* IV.1 (1991): 129-144.

Toury, Gideon. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute, 1980.

---. "Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance. Toward a TT-Oriented Approach to Literary Translation." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 9-27.

Wilss, W., and G. Thome, eds. *Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984.

2. SEMIOTICS OF THEATRE

Alter, Jean. "From Text to Performance. Semiotics of Theatrility." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 113-39.

Amossy, Ruth. "Semiotics and Theater. By Way of Introduction." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 5-10.

Appia, Adolphe. *Music and the Art of Theatre*. Trans. Robert W. Corrigan and Mary Douglas Dirks. Miami, 1962.

Bassnett, Susan. "Introduction to Theatre Semiotics." *Theatre Quarterly* 10.38 (1980b): 47-53.

---. "Structuralism and After: Trends and Tendencies in Theatre Analysis, Part Two." *New Theatre Quarterly* 1.2 May (1985a): 205-07.

Bogatyrev, Peter. "Les Signes du théâtre." *Poètique* 8 (1971): 517-30.

Campbell, Paul Newell. *Form and the Art of Theatre*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1984.

Coppieters, Frank. "Performance and Perception." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 35-48.

Corrigan, Robert W. *The Making of Theatre. From Drama to Performance*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1981.

Dawson, S.W. *Drama and the Dramatic. The Critical Idiom*. Vol. 11. Ed. John D. Jump. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1970.

Drama. Theater. Performance. Special Issue, *Poetics Today* 2.3 (Spring 1981).

Eco, Umberto. "Semiotics of Theatrical Performance." *The Drama Review* 21 (1977): 107-17.

Elam, Keir. "Language in the Theatre." *Sub-stance* (1970): 139-62.

---. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen, 1980.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika, *et al.*, eds. *The Dramatic Touch of Difference*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990.

Helbo, André. "Semiology of Theatre or: Communication Swamped." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 105-11.

Ingarden, Roman. "The Functions of Language in the Theatre." *The Literary Work of Art*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1973. 377-96.

Kesteren, Aloysius van. *Semiotics of Drama and Theatre. Linguistic and Literary Studies* *in Eastern Europe* 10, 1984.

Kowzan, Tadeusz. *Littérature et spectacle dans leur rapports esthétiques, thématiques et sémiologiques*. Varsovie: Éditions Scientifiques de Pologne, 1970.

---. "The Sign in the Theater. An Introduction to the Semiology of the Art of the Spectacle." Trans. Simon Pleasance. *Diogenes* 61 (1968): 52-80.

Matejka, Ladislav, and Irwin R. Titunk, eds. *Semiotics of Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1976.

Passow, Wilfried. "The Analysis of Theatrical Performance. The State of the Art." Trans. R. Strauss. *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 237-54.

Pavis, Patrice. *Dictionnaire du théâtre*. Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1980.

---. "Interculturalism in Contemporary Mise en Scène. The Image of India in 'The Mahabharata' and the 'Indiada.'" *The Dramatic Touch of Difference*. Eds. Erika Fischer-Lichte, *et al*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990. 57-71.

---. "Problems of a Semiology of Theatrical Gesture." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 65-93.

---. "Production et reception au théâtre: la concrétisation du texte dramatique et spectaculaire." *Revue des sciences humaines*. LX,189. Janvier-Mars (1983): 51-88.

---. "Remarques sur le discours théâtrale." *Degrés* 13 (1978): h-h10.

---. "Theatre Analysis: Some Questions and a Questionnaire." Trans. Susan Bassnett. *New Theatre Quarterly: NTQ* 1,2 (1985): 208-12.

---. "Vers une esthétique de la reception théâtrale." *La relation théâtrale*. Éds. V. Bourgy and R. Durand. Lille: Presses de l'U de Lille, 1980.

Platz-Waury, Elke. *Drama und Theater. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1980.

Schechner, Richard. "Drama, Script, Theatre and Performance." *The Drama Review* 17 (1973): 5-36.

Tennyson, G.B. *An Introduction to Drama*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Ubersfeld, Anne. *Lire le théâtre*. Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1978.

Veltrusky, Jirí. "Basic Features of Dramatic Dialogue." *Semiotics of Art*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunk. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1976. 128-33.

---. "Dramatic Text as a Component of Theater." *Semiotics of Art*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunk. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1976. 94-117.

3. TRANSLATION OF THEATRE TEXTS

Arrowsmith, William, and Roger Shattuck, eds. *The Craft and Context of Translation*. Austin: The U of Texas P, 1961.

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. "Translating Spatial Poetry: An Examination of Theatre Texts in Performance." *Literature and Translation*. Eds. James S. Holmes, *et al*. Leuven: ACCO, 1978. 161-176.

---. "Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against Performability," *TTR* VI, 1 (1991): 99-111.

---. "Ways Through the Labyrinth. Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts." *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literature and Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. New York: St. Martin's P, 1985b. 87-102.

Bednarz, Klaus. *Theatralische Aspekte der Dramenübersetzung. Dargestellt am Beispiel der deutschen Übertragungen und Bühnenbearbeitungen der Dramen Anton Cechovs*. Wien: Verlag Notring, 1969.

Bosley, Vivien. "Diluting the Mixture: Translating Michel Tremblay's *les Belles-sœurs*." *TTR — Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction. Études sur le texte et ses transformations* 1, 1 (1988): 139-45.

Corrigan, Robert W. "Translating for Actors." *The Craft and Context of Translation*. Eds. William Arrowsmith and Roger Shattuck. Austin: The U of Texas P, 1961. 95-106.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika, *et al.*, hrsg. *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 1. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1988.

Fisher-Lichte, Erika. "Zum kulturellen Transfer theatralischer Konventionen." *Literatur und Theater. Traditionen und Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Hrsg. Brigitte Schultze, *et al*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 4. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990. 35-62.

Gaddis Rose Marilyn, ed. *Translation: Agent of Communication*. Hamilton, New Zealand: Outrigger Publishers Ltd., 1980.

Gostand, Reba. "Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication: Drama as Translation." *The Languages of Theatre*. Ed. Ortrun Zuber. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1980. 1-9.

Homel, Davis, and Sherry Simon, eds. *Mapping Literature. The Art and Politics of Translation*. Montréal: Véhicule P, 1988.

House, Juliane. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1977.

Italiaander, R., hrsg. *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg, 1965*. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum (Athenäum Paperbacks), 1965.

Kahane, Éric. "Le Point de vue d'un traducteur: réponses à des questions sur la traduction des textes dramatiques." *Palimpsestes* 1, 1. *Traduire le dialogue. Traduire les textes de théâtre*. Paris: U de la Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III, 1987. 139-51.

Kittel, Harald, hrsg. *Die literarische Übersetzung. Stand und Perspektiven ihrer Erforschung*. Göttinger Beiträge zur internationalen Übersetzungsforschung Bd. 2. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1988.

Koustas, Jane. "Traduire ou ne pas traduire le théâtre? L'approche sémiotique." *TTR — Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction. Études sur le texte et ses transformations*. 1, 1 (1988): 127-38.

Leuven, Kitty M. van, and Ton Naaijkens. *Translation Studies: The State of the Art. Proceedings of the First James S. Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies*. Approaches to Translation Studies 9. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991.

Levý, Jirí. *Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung*. Frankfurt a.M.-Bonn: Athenäum Verlag, 1969.

Link, Franz H. "Translation, Adaptation and Interpretation of Dramatic Texts." *The Languages of Theatre*. Ed. Ortrun Zuber. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1980. 24-50.

Paul, Fritz, und Brigitte Schultze, hrsg. *Probleme der Dramenübersetzung 1960-1988. Eine Bibliographie*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 5. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1991.

Pavis, Patrice. "Problems of Translation for the Stage: Interculturalism and Post-Modern Theatre." *The Play out of Context. Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*.

Trans. Loren Kruger. Eds. Hanna Scolnicov and Peter Holland. Cambridge UP, 1989. 25-44.

Petrome-Fresco, Gaby. "The Hidden Text. Problems of Translation in *As You Like It.*" *Palimpsestes* 1, 1. *Traduire le dialogue. Traduire les textes de théâtre*. Paris: U de la Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III, 1987. 73-114.

Reiß, Katharina. *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1971.

Reiß, Katharina, und Hans J. Vermeer. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Linguistische Arbeiten 147. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1984.

Sahl, Hans. "Zur Übersetzen von Theaterstücken." *Übersetzen. Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg, 1965*. Hrsg. R. Italiaander. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum (Athenäum Paperbacks), 1965. 104-05.

Schultze, Brigitte, *et al.*, hrsg. *Literatur und Theater. Traditionen und Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 4. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990.

Schultze, Brigitte. "Problems of Cultural Transfer and Cultural Identity: Personal Names and Titles in Drama Translation." *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*. Eds. Harald Kittel and Armin Paul Frank. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1991. 91-110.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. "Sprechbare Sprache — Spielbarer Text. Zur Problematik der Bühnenübersetzung." *Modes of Interpretation*. Eds. Richard J. Watts and Urs Weidmann. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1984. 101-16.

---. *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.

---, hrsg. *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1986.

Tomarchio, Margaret. "Le Théâtre en traduction: quelques réflexions sur le rôle du traducteur (Beckett, Pinter)." *Palimpsestes* 3, 1. *Traduction/Adaptation*. Paris: U de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1990. 79-87.

Turk, Horst. "Konventionen und Traditionen. Zum Bedingungsrahmen der Übersetzung für das Theater oder für die Literatur." *Literatur und Theater. Traditionen und*

Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung. Hrsg. Brigitte Schultze, *et al.* Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 4. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990. 63-94.

---. "Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem des Dramas und der Übersetzung." *Soziale und theatralische Konventionen als Problem der Dramenübersetzung*. Hrsg. Erika Fischer-Lichte, *et al.* Forum Modernes Theater Bd. 1. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1988. 9-54.

Vermeer, Hans J. "Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer." *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*. Hrsg. Mary Snell-Hornby. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1986. 30-53.

Watson, Donald. "Bon esprit, bon sens ou bons mots." *Palimpsestes* 1, 1. *Traduire le dialogue. Traduire les textes de théâtre*. Paris: U de la Sorbonne Nouvelle III, 1987. 115-37.

Wilson, A. Leslie. "The Drama Translator and Production: A Perfect Match." *Coming of Age. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*. Ed. Deanna Lindberg Hammond. Medford, N.J.: Learned Information, 1989. 311-14.

Zuber, Ortrun, ed. *The Languages of Theatre*. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1980a.

---. *Page to Stage*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984.

Zuber, Ortrun. "Problems of Propriety and Authenticity in Translating Modern Drama." *The Languages of Theatre*. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1980b. 36-44.

---. "The Translation of Non-Verbal Signs in Drama." *Translation: Agent of Communication*. Ed. Marilyn Gaddis Rose. Hamilton, New Zealand: Outrigger Publishers Ltd., 1980c. 61-74.

4. NATURALISM

Becker, George J. *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.

Bigsby, C.W.E. *Twentieth Century American Drama*. Vol. I: 1900-1940. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Burkett, Eva M. *American English Dialects in Literature*. Metuchen N.J. & London: The Scarecrow P, Inc., 1978.

Chevrel, Yves, éd. *Le Naturalisme dans les littératures de langues européens. Textes et langages* VIII. Nantes: PU de Nantes, 1983.

---. *Le Naturalisme en question. Recherches actuelle en littérature comparée* II. Paris: P de l'U de Paris-Sorbonne, 1986.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1979.

Debbaut, Romain. "Esthétique naturaliste et définition du naturalisme dans la littérature d'expression néerlandaise." *Le Naturalisme en question. Recherches actuelle en littérature comparée* II. Éd. Yves Chevrel. Paris: P de l'U de Paris-Sorbonne, 1986. 67-76.

---. "Thématique et techniques d'écriture dans le naturalisme d'expression néerlandaise." *Le Naturalisme dans les littératures de langues européens. Textes et langages* VIII. Éd. Yves Chevrel. Nantes: PU de Nantes, 1983. 107-22.

Downer, Alan. *Fifty Years of American Drama 1900-1950*. Chicago: Regnery, 1951.

Furst, Lilian R., and Peter N. Skrine. *Naturalism. The Critical Idiom*. Vol. 18. Ed. John D. Jump. London: Methuen, 1971.

Gibbons Thomson, Ruth. "Dialect." *Index to Full Length Plays 1895-1925*. Boston: The F.W. Faxon Company, 1956. 111-13.

Hodgson, Terry. "Dialect." *The Batsford Dictionary of Drama*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1988. 91-92.

Krutch, Joseph W. *The American Drama since 1918. An Informal History*. New York: George Braziller Inc., 1957.

Malstrom, Jean, and Annabel Ashley. "Dialects in Literature." *Dialects — U.S.A.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963. 53-59.

McInnes, Edward. "Naturalism and the English Stage." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* I, 3. July (1985): 197-206.

Meserve, Walter J. *An Outline History of American Drama*. Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co, 1970.

Morris, James M. *Our Maritime Heritage: Marine Developments and their Impact on American Life*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979.

Murphy, Brenda. *American Realism and American Drama 1880-1940.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

"Naturalism." *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Micropaedia, Ready Reference. Vol. 8, 15th ed., 1990.

"Naturalism." *The Oxford Companion to American Literature.* 5th ed., 1983.

"Naturalism." *The Oxford Companion to the Theatre.* 4th ed., 1983.

"Naturalism." *The Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1962.

Nettels, Elsa. "Realism and Dialect." *Language, Race, and Social Class in Howells's America.* Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1988. 62-71.

Pizer, Donald. *Twentieth Century American Literary Naturalism.* Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1982.

Prince, Felix. *André Antoine et le renouveau de théâtre hollandais (1880-1900).* Amsterdam: de Academische Boekhandel N.V., 1941.

"Realism and Naturalism." *The Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.

Scarlyn Wilson, N. *European Drama.* London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1937.

Speirs, Dorothy E. "Le Naturalisme américain et ses relations avec le naturalisme européen." *Le Naturalisme en question. Recherches actuelle en littérature comparée* II. Éd. Yves Chevrel. Paris: P de l'U de Paris-Sorbonne, 1986. 131-38.

Vaughn, Jack A. "Dialect." *Drama A to Z.* New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1978. 54-55.

West, Dorothy H., and Dorothy M. Peake. "Dialect." *Play Index 1949-1952.* New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1953. 42-43.

Zola, Émile. *Le Roman expérimental.* 4th ed. Paris: G. Charpentier, 1880.

---. *Thérèse Raquin.* Paris: Éditions Fasquelle, 1970.

5. HERMAN HEIJERMANS

Barnouw, A.J. "Herman Heijermans." *Theatre Arts Monthly* 9. Feb. 1925: 109-12.

Boyer, Robert D. *Realism in European Theatre and Drama 1870-1920: A Bibliography.* Wesport, Conn.: Greenwood P, 1979. 26-27.

Bruning, Peter. "Herman Heijermans." *Encyclopedia of World Literature in the 20th Century*. Vol. 2. Rev. ed. Ed. Leonard S. Klein. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1982. 349-50.

Clark, Barrett H. *A Study of the Modern Drama. A Handbook for the Study and Appreciation of the Best Plays, European, English, and American of the Last Half Century*. New York-London: D. Appleton and Company, 1925. 178-81.

D'Amico, Silvio, ed. "Herman Heijermans." *Enciclopedia dello Spettacolo* VI. Roma: Casa Editrice le Maschere, 1959. 251-53.

Dukes, Ashley. *Modern Dramatists*. (rpt.) Freeport, N.J.: Books for Libraries P Inc., 1967. 254-63.

Engel, F. "Herman Heijermans." *Berliner Tageblatt*. 24 Nov. 1924: 2.

Flaxman, Seymour L. "Herman Heijermans." *Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature*. 2nd ed. Eds. Jean-Albert Bédé and William B. Edgerton. New York: Columbia UP, 1980. 355.

---. "Herman Heijermans." *Critical Survey of Drama*. Foreign Language Series 3. Ed. Frank N. Magill. Englewood N.J.: Salem P, 1986. 909-15.

---. *Herman Heijermans and his Dramas*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954.

---. "Herman Heijermans on the New York Stage." *The Germanic Review* XXVII. 2 Apr. 1952: 131-37.

Gassner, John. *Masters of the Drama*. 3rd ed. Dover Publications, Inc., 1954. 467-69.

"Herman Heijermans." *Contemporary Authors*. Vol 123. Eds. Hal May and Susan M. Trosky. Detroit, MI: Gale Research Company, 1988. 156.

"Herman Heijermans." *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama*. Vol. 2. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972. 319-24.

"Herman Heijermans." *Modern World Drama: An Encyclopedia*. Ed. Myron Matlaw. New York: Dutton, 1972. 349.

Jong, Evert de. *Herman Heijermans en de vernieuwing van het Europese drama*. Studia Litteraria Rheno-Traiectina XI. Groningen: Wolters, 1967.

Knetsch, Piet Reinier. *"In Hope of Providence" by Herman Heijermans: a New Translation for Performance of "The Good Hope."* Diss. U of Kansas, 1984. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1984. 8513753.

Mason Brown, John. "Sermons in Plays. Broadway in Review." *Theatre Arts Monthly* 11. Dec. (1927): 895-97, 899.

Meijer, Reinder P. *Literature of the Low Countries. A Short History of Dutch Literature in the Netherlands and Belgium*. The Hague/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978. 256-59.

Neck Yoder, Hilda van. *Dramatizations of Social Change: Herman Heijermans' Plays as Compared with Selected Dramas by Ibsen, Hauptmann and Chekhov*. The Hague: Mouton: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978.

Panter, P. "Herman Heijermans." *Die Weltbühne* 20, 49 (1924): 849-51.

Raché, P. "Heijermans' Leben und Werk." *Berliner Tageblatt*. 24 Nov. 1924: 2.

Rischbieter, Henning, hrsg. *Friedrichs Theaterlexikon von A-Z*. Velber bei Hannover: Friedrich Verlag, 1969. 205.

Saunders, Lillian. "Herman Heijermans, Playwright and Director." *The Drama* 13. July (1923): 331-32.

Schilp, C.A. *Herman Heijermans*. Amsterdam: Moussault, 1967.

Shipley, Joseph T. *Guide to Great Plays*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs P, 1956. 302-03.

Sobel, Bernard, ed. *The New Theatre Handbook and Digest of Plays*. New York: Crown Publishers Inc., 1959. 354.

6. *OP HOOP VAN ZEGEN* AND ITS TRANSLATIONS

Heijermans, Herman. *Op hoop van zegen. Spel van de zee in vier bedrijven*. repr. Amsterdam: Querido, 1962.

---. *The Good Hope. An English Version by Christopher St. John of "Op Hoop van Zegen" a Play in Four Acts by Herman Heijermans*. London: Hendersons, 1903.

---. "The Good Hope. A Drama of the Sea in Four Acts." Trans. Harriet Gampert Higgins. *The Drama: a Quarterly Review of Dramatic Literature*. November 8, 1912: 16-104.

---. *The Good Hope. A Drama of the Sea*. Trans. Lilian Saunders and Caroline Heijermans-Houwink. New York: Samuel French, 1928.

---. *In Hope of Providence. Play of the Sea in Four Acts*. Trans. Piet Reinier Knetsch. *"In Hope of Providence" by Herman Heijermans: a New Translation for Performance of "The Good Hope."* Diss. U of Kansas, 1984. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1984. 8513753. 147-264.

STAGE SOCIETY'S PERFORMANCE OF *THE GOOD HOPE*. IMPERIAL THEATRE, LONDON. APRIL 24, 1903.

Beerbohm, Max. "A Dreary Play." *The Saturday Review*. May 2, 1903: 548-49.

"Drama. The Week." *The Athenaeum* 3940. May 2, 1903: 572.

"The Good Hope." *The Era*. May 2, 1903: 13.

"The Good Hope." *The New York Times*. May 10, 1903, III: 25.

"Imperial Theatre." *The Times*. Apr. 28, 1903: 4.

The London Telegraph. Apr. 25, 1903.

The Observer. May 3, 1903: 7

The Sketch. May 6, 1903: 90.

"The Stage Society." *The Stage*. Apr. 30, 1903: 11.

"The Stage Society's Production — 'The Good Hope.'" *The Illustrated London News*. May 2, 1903: 653.

THE GOOD HOPE IN NEW YORK. EMPIRE THEATRE. FEBRUARY 11, 1907.

Darnton, Charles. *The Evening World*. Feb. 12, 1907.

"Ellen Terry in Realistic Play." *The New York Times*. Feb. 12, 1907: 9.

The New York Daily Tribune. Feb. 12, 1907.

New York Dramatic Mirror LVII. Feb. 23, 1907: 3.

New York Herald. Feb. 12, 1907.

"The Reckoning, The Good Hope, All-of-a-Sudden Peggy, Genessee of the Hills." *The New York Times*. Feb. 17, 1907. IV: 2.

Theatre Magazine 73. 1907: 58.

Theatre Magazine 74. 1907: 105.

THE GOOD HOPE AT KING'S HALL. LONDON, NOVEMBER 3, 1912

"'The Good Hope' at the King's Hall." *The Academy* 83. Nov. 9, 1912: 608.

"Heijermans' Masterpiece. 'The Good Hope' Revived." *Pall Mall Gazette*. Nov. 4, 1912: 5.

Palmer, John. "A Good Play from the Dutch." *The Saturday Review*. Nov. 9, 1912: 576-77.

THE CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE'S PERFORMANCE OF *THE GOOD HOPE*. NEW YORK, OCTOBER 18, 1927.

Brooks Atkinson, J. "Dutch to Russian." *The New York Times*. Oct. 23, 1927. VIII: 1.

---. "The Play." *The New York Times*. Oct. 19, 1927: 24.

Durham, Weldon B., ed. *American Theatre Companies 1888-1930*. New York: Greenwood P, 1987. 81-86.

"The Good Hope." *The Outlook* CXLVII. Nov. 1927: 340-41.

"The Good Hope." *Vogue* 70. Dec. 5, 1927: 114.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. "Drama. Dutch Interior." *The Nation* 125. Nov. 2, 1927: 485-86.

Sayler, Oliver M. "The Play of the Week." *The Saturday Review of Literature* 4. Nov. 5, 1927: 275-76.

Young, Stark. "Good Beginnings." *New Republic* 52. Nov. 2, 1927: 285.